

that has spoken on any subject has taken his full fifteen minutes, and out of that time five minutes was usually consumed in giving the personal history of the particular delegate. Now, perhaps if we cut it to ten minutes the delegates will leave out the personal reminiscences and give us ten minutes' discussion of the subject before the congress. I believe that all I know about any particular subject that is to come before this congress I can give in ten minutes, after others have expressed themselves. I hope the delegates will remember that even under a ten minute rule it only gives us six speakers to the hour. But we have had only four speakers to the hour heretofore. The delegates are tired; and probably some of those who have made the longest speeches are tired, because they are not with us tonight.

The motion to change the time limit on speeches to ten minutes was then carried.

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I move that the hour for adjournment tonight be set at 10:30.

THE CHAIRMAN: The rule adopted for night sessions is that we shall open at 8 P. M. and close at 10 P. M.

DEL. JACOBSEN (Ia.). I have a motion here. I move that the secretary be instructed to insert in the or-

der of business a report of the Committee on Government by Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where does the comrade wish it inserted?

DEL. JACOBSEN: Between F and G.

DEL. BERGER: What is it you are putting it before?

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): I understand the chairman of the committee that has been considering this question of government by commission desires to have their report made right after the report of the Committee on Constitution. That is, they desire to have it inserted between J and K. That was the request of Comrade Thompson.

DEL. JACOBSEN: That is correct, I accept that amendment to my motion.

The motion to insert report of Committee on Government by Commission between items J and K was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, I believe that the next order of business is to dispose of the report of the International Delegates.

DEL. BERGER: I move that my report be read last and then both of them disposed of at the same time. They are connected, but mine is the later date.

The secretary then read the reports of the international delegates as follows:

REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST MOVEMENT.

To the National Congress of the Socialist Party.

COMRADES: While the prime object of this Congress is to survey the problems and conditions of the Socialist movement of the United States and to devise effective methods of strengthening our own party, our work would not be complete without at least a brief review of the recent struggles and achievements of our comrades in other countries. Our movement is an organic and inseparable part of the worldwide struggle of the working class for the emancipation of mankind from the thralldom of capital, and its progress and success are largely influenced by the general march of international Socialism.

Only two years have elapsed since I last had the honor of reporting to you the condition of the international Socialist movement, but this short span of time has been exceptionally eventful for our movement. It has witnessed many struggles and some defections, many victories and some repulses, but on the whole it has been marked by a closer drawing of the lines of battle, a distinct step towards the social revolution.

In the countries in which our movement is as yet young and weak, the ruling classes have, as usual, made vain efforts to crush it in the bud by brutal force and cruel persecutions.

In Russia, the triumphant powers of absolutism and reaction indulge in veritable orgies of death and bloodshed. The gallows have taken the place of the "constitution," and the thousands of champions of the cause of liberty, mostly Socialists, are being executed every year without trial or hearing.

In Spain, the first concrete expression of Socialist and workingmen's revolt in recent times took the form of a strong anti-militarist movement. The government had

planned a military expedition against Morocco for the benefit of the capitalists of Spain, but the Spanish workers refused to shed their blood and that of their innocent brothers of Morocco for the profit and pleasure of their masters, and rose in open insurrection against the government. The rising was suppressed and the ruling powers of Spain wreaked terrible vengeance upon the rebellious workers. The culmination of the government's brutalities was the arrest and execution of the noted radical and founder of the "New School" of education, Francisco Ferrer, on September 13, 1909.

In Argentina, the government, through the instrumentality of Chief of Police Ramon Falcon, made the May Day labor parade of 1909 the pretext for a ruthless massacre of the workers. Falcon was subsequently killed by an unknown hand, and his assassination was made the occasion of a series of persecutions unparalleled in point of cruelty in the history of the republic. Martial law was declared for the whole country, the Socialist papers were suppressed, and the party headquarters forcibly closed. Workingmen's libraries were in some instances reduced to ashes, and about six hundred workingmen and Socialists were imprisoned.

In Japan and Roumania, countries so different and distant from each other and yet so similar in the scale of industrial development and the condition of the Socialist movement, our comrades have within the last two years been equally persecuted and harassed by the government.

There is nothing new or alarming in these persecutions for our comrades abroad. They recognize them as a necessary phase in the development of our movement, as a harbinger of progress and gage of victory. The Socialists of Russia are slowly recovering and steadily gathering new strength for another and probably final onslaught on the monster of czarism; the workingmen of Spain have answered the brutalities of this government by electing their first Socialist representative to parliament in the elections just past, and our comrades in Roumania, Argentina and Japan, true to the traditions of the Socialist movement, have gained in numbers and strength under the persecution.

And on the other hand the Socialist workers abroad have within the last two years not been lagging behind their governments in initiating and fighting class wars. In Sweden the Employers' Association, taking advantage of the industrial depression, decided to crush the growing hosts of organized labor. On July 28, 1909, eighty thousand workers were locked out by the concerted action of their employers. Swedish labor answered the attack by a general strike, involving three hundred thousand workers, a majority of all workers of the country! The struggle lasted almost six months, and was epoch making in the history of the Socialist and labor movements of the world. It was the first concrete and undisguised test of strength between the capitalists and workers of any country, a mimic war of the revolution. It ended in a compromise, and neither of the contestants gained substantial material benefits through it. But it served to show that in the most advanced countries labor as a whole may at any time be plunged into the last and decisive battle with the capitalist class—it was a *Mene Tekel Upharsin* for the entire capitalist system. Very extensive labor strikes also occurred in France and Italy, and in all these cases the Socialists were the leading spirits in the struggles. Nor were the battles of Socialism during this period limited to the economic field alone. In Germany our comrades are carrying on a splendid campaign for a radical reform of the monstrous electoral system in Prussia; in Hungary they are making a determined fight for universal suffrage and in most other countries they lead the fight for the full enfranchisement of the people.

Our comrades abroad never quit the armor and they grow and wax strong in the steady struggle. The international army of Socialism has made some mighty advances since our last convention.

In Germany the slight setback of the last parliamentary elections has spurred our comrades to redoubled activity, and their work has borne signal fruit. The trade-unions, which in Germany are closely allied with the Socialists, have more than doubled in numbers within the last few years, and the party itself has marvelously increased in strength. At its last congress, in September, 1909, it reported more than 630,000 enrolled members, and no less than 74 daily papers. In June, 1908, it succeeded for the first time in electing representatives (7 in number) to the Prussian Landtag, and almost every by-election to the Reichstag has been carried by the Socialists.

In France our comrades gained about 300,000 votes and 22 new seats in parliament in the elections which closed this month. In Italy we gained 20 seats in the elections of March, 1909; in Belgium we gained 5 seats in the elections of 1908; in Holland our vote rose from 65,000 to 82,000 in the elections of 1909, and in Finland in the same year our party polled about 40 per cent of the entire popular vote, and elected 84 out of a total of 200 deputies to parliament.

In Australia and New Zealand the scattered Socialist groups have united into one organization and have laid the basis for a strong Socialist party. In the most backward parts of Europe, those of the Balkan peninsula, the Socialist movement has recently made its triumphant entry as a permanent factor. In January, of this year, the Socialists of Serbia, Bulgaria, Roumania, Macedonia, Turkey, Croatia, Slavonia, Bosnia, Herzegovina and Montenegro met in joint convention, and formed a permanent confederation for the propaganda and struggles of Socialism.

The Socialist movement is rapidly penetrating into every section of the globe, and when the International Socialist congress will assemble at Copenhagen in August of this year, it will be in the true sense of the term a Parliament of Man.

Comrades, that steady and irresistible growth of our movement, its tremendous vitality and vigor, more than any mere theory, offers to the Socialists of the world, and the American Socialists among them, a guaranty of the ultimate triumph of our great cause. Long Live International Socialism!

Fraternally submitted,
MORRIS HILLQUIT.

REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SECRETARY.

To the National Committee of the Socialist Party of America.

Greetings:—The annual meeting of the International Bureau was held in the People's Palace, 17 Joseph-Stevens street, 6th to 8th November, 1909.

The Board sat three days. Saturday was taken up by the business of Socialist Journalism; on Sunday the eleventh meeting of the International Socialist Bureau proper took place; and Monday was devoted to the parliamentary commission.

The report of the third conference of Socialist Journalists contained a list of leading Socialist newspapers with the addresses of writers in the various countries who are willing to contribute articles on special subjects. And the first observation I made was that the list from America was meagre indeed. It contained only three names. Camille Huysman, the International Secretary, explained that these were all the names which had been sent to him from America at the time when the bulletin went to press, but that he had received some more names later.

The representatives of the Humanite, comrades Landvieux and Morizet, wanted the meeting to decide as to the kind of advertising which Socialist papers the world over could accept and what they should reject. After some discussion it was decided to leave the discussion of this point to the future.

On Sunday morning the Board considered the time and the order of business for the International Congress which is to meet in Copenhagen in 1910. The Danish comrades proposed a week in September, because they said that at that time it would be easiest to find proper hotel accommodations in Copenhagen. However, this date was opposed by the Germans and the English because party and trades unions congresses are to be held about that time in both England and Germany. So finally the last days of August and the first days of September were agreed upon unanimously.

A long discussion took place on account of the "order of the day" for the next International Congress.

The Co-operative movement is making rapid strides in most of the European countries and some of the delegates wanted the relation of the Co-operative movement to the Socialist movement put upon the order of business. Others contended that the agrarian question should be added.

The Polish delegate, Comrade Diamont, wanted the abolition of capital punishment for political offenses discussed at the congress. Keir Hardie and Quelch proposed a discussion of the eight-hour day, while the Swedish comrade suggested that the question of immediate help, financial aid, to nations where the working class is on a great fight or general strike, should be made an order of the day.

The Bureau finally decided that the next International Congress should be in-

vited to instruct the Bureau to prepare an exhaustive report on the agrarian question for discussion in 1913. Vaillant of France, Molkenbuhr of Germany, Branting of Sweden, Adler of Austria, and your delegate all took the view that the agrarian question differs so much in the various countries that it would be better first to study it in all its phases before the International Bureau took it up.

So at last the order of business was fixed as proposed by the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of America, namely, first, the relation between the parties and the Co-operatives; second, the International results of labor legislation, with the addition that the question of helping Socialist parties in need, should also be taken up.

The question of the abolition of capital punishment for political offenses was declined because the Socialist congress had gone on record against all capital punishment and this was considered sufficient.

On Sunday afternoon resolutions of sympathy to the Spanish workers in their martyrdom, with the Swedish ironworkers, who were still carrying on the general strike—without much financial support from anywhere except from Germany and Austria—and a protest against the violent expulsion of a Socialist comrade from Roumania, were disposed of without discussion.

Comrade Fabrier, who represented Spain, declared that if sufficient financial aid were to be had, the movement in Spain would succeed in winning at least constitutional freedom for that country.

The Bureau then went into executive session in order to take up the difficulty in Holland. A section of the Holland Social-Democracy, the Nieuwe Tyd crowd, had split off on a question of tactics and had formed a new party. The Socialist movement in Holland is weak, the party as a whole having only about six thousand members. The secessionists did not ask for any representation in the Bureau, but they demanded to be recognized as a Socialist party and accorded representation in the International Congress.

Singer of Germany moved that this should be granted. And this was seconded by Vaillant of France.

However, Adler of Austria moved a substitute motion which recommended the parties to patch up their differences, and should they fail, it would be left to the International Congress whether the new party should have representation or not. The motion of Adler was adopted by sixteen to eleven votes. And thus the new party will not be represented at the congress unless it is given representation by the congress itself.

Then the motion of your delegate came up to grant the Socialist party of America both of the two seats in the International Bureau. The chairman of the session, Comrade Vandervelde, was inclined to declare the motion out of order. He claimed that the Bureau had no jurisdiction in this respect and that the matter must be decided by the next International Congress, or, more correctly, by the American delegates at that congress.

However, your delegate took the floor. He explained in a few words that the Socialist Labor party had gone downward continually since the year 1898; that it now legally and practically had ceased as a party, and that it had only a nominal paper existence.

Your delegate stated that the Socialist party had 42,000 members and cast 450,000 votes, while the membership of the so-called Socialist Labor party could not be determined. However, at national referendum, they only cast about three or four hundred votes and their vote in the last presidential election was less than thirteen thousand. Your delegate, moreover, pointed out that under these conditions the Socialist Labor party could at best be considered a propaganda club. And that as long as we had over ninety-seven per cent of the total Socialist vote cast, and even a larger percentage of the membership, it was ridiculously unjust and unjustly ridiculous to grant the Socialist Labor party the same representation as we have, that is, one man each on the Bureau.

Whereupon the representative of the Socialist Labor party, a man by the name of Kretlow, who lives in Berlin, Germany (and whom nobody seemed to know, and least of all the German delegates), began to recite a long story that the Socialist party of America is made up of ex-preachers, lawyers, business men and bourgeois only; that it was not a workingmen's party and that all the workingmen were in the Socialist Labor party.

I did not answer any of these so-called arguments, because it was plainly to be

seen from the faces of those present that he made exactly the same impression on them as on me.

Only when Mr. Kretlow claimed that we were fusing everywhere with the Republicans and Democrats, I interrupted with the words, "That is a lie."

And by that time the patience of the chairman and of the Bureau seemed to be exhausted. Mr. Kretlow was told to sit down and the Bureau went on with its other business, with the decision that the matter of the election of the two secretaries for America should be left entirely to the American delegation in Copenhagen.

Comrade Labrada of Mexico then made a statement concerning the way in which the Mexican government there is oppressing the people and particularly labor. He also called attention to the fact that a Mexican refugee in Los Angeles was in danger of being extradited to Diaz. Upon motion of your delegate the matter of the Mexican refugee was referred to Comrade John C. Chase, president of the Political Refugee Defense League of America, and furthermore the International Bureau was instructed to frame resolutions asking the Socialist members of the various parliaments to call the attention of their respective legislative bodies to the atrocious government in Mexico whenever there is a chance for this.

On Monday the parliamentary commission met and there was an interesting discussion on old age pensions, and insurance against sickness, invalidity and non-employment.

There were present at the meeting among others Singer and Molkenbuhr from Germany, Adler from Austria, Troelstra and Van Koll from Holland, Keir Hardie and Quelch from England, Rubimovich from Russia, Vandervelde and Anseele from Belgium, Guesde and Vaillant from France.

Janres and Bebel were absent, the first on account of business and the other on account of illness.

The work of the Socialist Bureau struck me as being rather cumbersome and tedious on account of the three different languages, French, German and English, that are continually spoken there. The parliamentary rules under which it is conducted also strike an American or Englishman rather queerly. However, the International Bureau undoubtedly has a great mission to fulfill. And the earnestness and the caliber of the men who composed it, are a guarantee that the Bureau will fulfill it.

Faternally submitted,

VICTOR L. BERGER.

DEL. HAINES (Tenn.): I understand that these reports have been printed. Should they not have been placed in the hands of the delegates in order that we might intelligently discuss them? They have been printed, but never delivered to us; why is that?

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe that if they were accepted we should all receive them.

DEL. JACOBSEN: I move that those reports be adopted.

DEL. HUBSCHMITT (N. J.): And that they be printed and distributed to the membership throughout the United States.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, that will be included in the motion.

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.): I think we should go slow. That is rather a big undertaking. If we are going to print fifty thousand of those and send them broadcast it will cost a lot of money. They might be printed in the Bulletin.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would not the

comrade be satisfied if they are printed in the proceedings?

DEL. HUBSCHMITT: I didn't want them printed to please me. If they are printed in the record that is satisfactory.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection that part of it need not be included at all. All in favor of the motion that the reports be adopted will say aye.

The motion was carried and the reports declared adopted by the congress.

ELECTION OF INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIES.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next business is the election of international secretaries. What is your pleasure, comrades?

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): Do I understand that in electing secretaries we are to elect two secretaries?

THE CHAIRMAN: The plurality is used here. I don't know what was intended when it was printed.

DEL. FRAENCKEL: I simply desired that information. Judging by the report of Comrade Berger this matter will have to be settled by somebody, whether this congress has a right to elect secretaries when we have no assurance that they will be seated.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): America will have sixteen votes.

DEL. HILLQUIT: Fourteen.

DEL. BERGER: I thought it was sixteen. Then it will have fourteen votes at the next international congress and the majority of those fourteen will elect two secretaries to the bureau. Heretofore the Socialist Labor Party had one secretary, although as Comrade Fraenckel knows, we have about ninety-seven per cent of the vote. Now it is ridiculous to grant the Socialist Labor Party just as big a representation as we have. It is simply ridiculous. Besides, they use it in their propaganda everywhere, telling everybody that they are part of the international movement, and they have a delegate there and are represented there. They use it against us. It is poor policy to let them have it when they are not entitled to it. I was told at the last meeting of the Bureau that that was entirely left to us. If we elect the delegates and don't want to give them a secretary then it is absolutely our own business. I believe we ought to elect two secretaries. I am not at all inclined to exclude them altogether; we have fourteen votes let them have one. That is more than they are entitled to. You can hardly give them less although some of them have only half a vote.

Now I believe Dan DeLeon, that old friend of mine, has said some awful things about me for many years, as you all know, but I am willing he should have one vote and the other thirteen ought to belong to us. And the thirteen should elect two international secretaries. The thirteen can elect any two that are there. We will send just eight who will poll the thirteen votes. However, we want the opinion of this congress who the two secretaries ought to be. That is all there is to it. The international delegates are elected by referendum; they will have to elect the secretaries; however, they will be guided by your judgment in the matter.

DEL. WORK (Ia.): I move that our delegates at the International Con-

gress be instructed to vote for our present incumbents, Morris Hillquit and Victor L. Berger, as international secretaries.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of that motion will please say aye. Those opposed no. The motion is carried with one vote opposed.

LIMITING DEBATE ON ANY SUBJECT.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I desire to ask a question because I am not exactly clear, and if you will permit me to state my purpose then perhaps you can answer me more intelligently. As you know, the intention was that this congress should adjourn tomorrow night at the latest. We have only transacted really one piece of business—

DEL. BERGER: And we didn't do that right.

DEL. GOEBEL: I voted the other way and I think we did. If we take the same time on other subjects we shall not get through by Sunday night. Now it seems to me that in order that we may ensure getting through some time we might adopt a rule that no subject shall be debated beyond a certain time and then we proceed to have the summing up speeches and the vote. Now I will make a motion to bring this before the house and you can decide whether it is in order or not. My motion is that at no time shall any debate extend beyond three hours before the summing up speeches are made and the vote then taken; and that so far as possible the chairman in recognizing speakers shall recognize speakers pro and con, on both sides of the matter. I can make that plainer in writing, but I think you understand what I mean by it. It does not mean that everything must necessarily be debated that long, but it means that no matter what the subject it cannot be debated more than three hours.

THE CHAIRMAN: With a ten minute limit on speakers and thirty minutes for the reporters I do not see how you can make that effective, unless a number of the delegates will make up their minds that they will not speak ten minutes, and not say anything if they have not anything to say.

DEL. MAURER (Pa.): I am glad that Comrade Goebel sees the error he made when he opposed my motion to have the speeches limited to ten min-

utes. I think we could get over this matter very nicely if we adopted the plan we had some years ago when each of the states would select a speaker to represent that state. I think each state knows well who will be the best qualified to speak on the question before us. Some states won't want to speak on it at all. The delegates from each state can make their points among themselves and then have the speaker speak for the whole state. I offer that as an amendment to Comrade Goebel's motion.

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.): We had a little hysteria this afternoon; now we are going to have a little more hysteria. We are to put a rope on ourselves for fear that we shall run away. This idea of confining ourselves to three hours, no matter what the subject, putting ourselves in a Procrustean bed, getting so much knowledge in a given time is ridiculous. The amendment of Comrade Maurer is even worse. Every state would want to talk and moreover every state is not a unit. Milwaukee might not vote together, and I should hate to see a fight among the Milwaukee delegation on the floor of the congress. I do not look upon speaking as a privilege. I look upon it as a service to the congress. You will notice I have not done much service so far. I hope that these arbitrary motions will not be adopted.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I would rather limit the time of the reporters. It is not necessary for them to have thirty minutes or even fifteen minutes to close. That is the rule and you ought to change that rule. On this state question many states have only one delegate. That makes him speak on every question. That is the danger. Then the comrade who made the motion would have us in a state submit to one man or have a fight, as Comrade Simons suggested. I move you, Comrade Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: There is already a motion.

DEL. BERGER: I move to amend it so that the reporters also be limited to fifteen minutes. They can report a whole lot in fifteen minutes.

DEL. PREVEY (Ohio): I do not believe we should go to extremes tonight. If the women were doing all the work you would expect our emotions to run away with us, because we are supposed to be governed by our emotions rather than by our reason-

ing faculties. It seems to me we are just getting acquainted with ourselves tonight, and realize our limitations, but we must not run away with ourselves and go to the other extreme. We should have got acquainted with ourselves before we left home and let off some of the steam, out on the street corner, and be ready when we came here to do business in a sensible manner. I am not in favor of Comrade Goebel's motion. We have already limited the time for each speaker to ten minutes. Now there are important matters to come before the congress and I want to say that if comrades will exercise a little control over themselves so that they won't annoy the speaker and the congress by constant points of order, and fine distinctions on rules of procedure for the purpose of showing what fine parliamentarians we are, we will get along better. We women know something of parliamentary law too, but we have retained sufficient self-control that we don't annoy the chairman at every opportunity. And after all, constitutions and rules of procedure are adopted to facilitate business. We sometimes forget that they are simply an instrument to be used for an end. We use them for our convenience that we may do business. But we have had such a display of parliamentary tactics today that I rather think if we went along in a little more anarchistic fashion we might do more business. Remember that we are representatives of a working class party and the working class ought to be charmed by some of their representatives.

Now I am going to suggest to the sergeant at arms that if he cannot control the delegates that he should appoint some women assistants. I am opposed to Comrade Goebel's motion; and I am in favor of the amendment that the time of reporters shall be limited to fifteen minutes.

DEL. WORK (Ia): I just want to say that I made a report here which was so hot that it had to be put in cold storage for awhile and when it comes up I want my full time to close the discussion of it. I do not think that I ought to be barred out of that opportunity.

DEL. BERGER: I move the previous question.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I have a closing word. You will find I have

not spoken for two days; so I practice what I preach. I think the most important thing here is the Committee on Constitution. Our papers for the last six months have been filled with all sorts of criticisms on our constitution, and it seems to have been considered important as it is the last thing on the programme. I have my expenses paid me and three dollars a day and some of the delegates are not paid a penny.

THE CHAIRMAN: You can help them if you will close so that we can proceed.

DEL. GOEBEL: If you will let me alone I will close. My motion means this: we have at least four main topics and this means that each of them can take half a day. Ten minutes means that we can have eighteen speeches and then the reporter or chairman of the committee, and that means prac-

tically half a day. If we cannot settle those questions in half a day it seems to me that we cannot settle them at all. If you want to see how the women carry on a debate wait until the Women's Committee report comes up and then we men can sit silent and smile.

The motion to limit the debate on any one subject to three hours was lost on a division.

The motion of Delegate Berger to limit the reporters and chairmen of committees to fifteen minutes was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next business is the report of the Woman's National Committee. Comrade May Wood-Simons, I believe, is the reporter.

Delegate M. W. Simons then read the report as follows:

REPORT ON PROPAGANDA AMONG WOMEN.

To the National Congress Socialist Party:

In submitting our report we, The Woman's National Committee, will dwell briefly upon the facts which brought about the creation of our committee, and upon the questions essential to the development of a healthy class consciousness among women.

We have watched closely the growing interest in the woman question which is going on the world over and, after due consideration, have come to the conclusion that its rapid development and growth is due more to woman's entrance upon the economic field, to her becoming an important factor in industry, than to her awakening sex consciousness.

Women have come to share in our industrial life. In the United States alone the number of wage earning women reaches almost six millions, or about one-third of our industrial population. And this situation is still varying from day to day, ever presenting new phases and giving birth to new problems which demand the earnest attention of the Socialist party—the only representative body of the working class.

Comrades, on our ability to cope with this force will depend not only the enlistment and support of the working women, but also the rapid introduction of the principles of Socialism into the homes of the working class. Our close study of this problem shows us that we have many different phases to reckon with in our propaganda of Socialism among women.

We must first of all discover and adopt the easiest method of awakening the still dormant thought of the average woman, and for this reason we must place ourselves in her position, always bearing in mind the great disadvantages woman has been laboring under for many centuries. We must take into account the double task she is performing today and the utter lack of privileges that are hers. In this way alone, and not along the general lines of propaganda among the working class at large, can we hope to reach the millions of female toilers, who work in and out of the home.

Such an undertaking is impossible for our party as a whole, hence the necessity of a special committee which would give its time and attention to the propaganda of Socialism among women.

In her book, "Women and the Trades," Elizabeth Butler justly says: "The numbers of women workers in competitive industry are greater today than they were

fifty, twenty-five or even ten years ago. There is every indication that these numbers will continue to increase proportionately, as we have no reason to believe that the problems presented by the industrial employment of women will be solved by a cessation of that employment."

We quote the statement of a woman who has spent many years in investigating the conditions she describes and wish to emphasize the fact that what is true in the economic world is equally true in reference to woman's position in the Socialist party.

Many years ago our comrades, in accord with the Socialist principles of equality, inserted the equal suffrage clause in our platform. But it remained a dead letter until the progress of industrial evolution brought woman to the front. Even as late as 1904, during the session of our National Convention, we find only five women delegates there. The woman question in general and the propaganda of Socialism among women in particular was not mentioned at all during the entire period of the convention.

The last three years have marked a great exodus of women from the home into the industrial and business world. Woman's unrest became world-wide and, in view of these facts, the International Congress in session at Stuttgart placed itself on record by recommending a more active propaganda for woman's enfranchisement.

A year later our American comrades assembled in National Convention at Chicago appointed a special committee for the propaganda of Socialism among women. At that time we find nineteen women delegates on the floor of the convention, many of them taking a prominent part in the proceedings.

None can help realizing that the woman question today is as truly an economic question as the general labor question. The only reason we advocate special methods for propaganda among women is the fact that those of us who have many years of experience in actual work among women, both on the industrial and political field, have come to the conclusion that the general make-up of woman's trend of thought, of her interests and sympathies, is, at least for the present, greatly different from that of the man, which does not mean that it is inferior. The executive body of the party has also come to the conclusion that not all people can be reached by the same methods of propaganda. We do not attempt to apply the same means of propaganda in converting the college man as we do the laborer, the Slav as we do the Anglo-Saxon.

The majority of the female sex is today degraded and enslaved because of economic dependence. If the problem of existence is a difficult matter for the man it is still more so for the woman and, unfortunately for the latter, she has so long attached her existence to that of man, that we find her at present lacking in some qualities which carry independence with them. But her extreme suffering, on the other hand, assigns the working woman from the start to the ranks of the fighting proletariat.

The industrial development has thrust woman into the world to become an atom among many others. You will find her in our mills, factories, mines, workshops and stores—out of some three hundred and fifty-eight trades, there are scarcely more than eight left where woman is not employed. But, though torn away from the home and her old environments, woman still remains a slave to its traditions and superstitions.

The increasing disinheritation of the masses, their ever growing deprivation, is affecting the wage-earning woman and even more so the workingman's wife. Woman, as a goodly portion of our wage earning population whose shortage in bread is increasing daily, will surely become a powerful factor in the progress of our movement, and this as soon as we enable her to understand the causes to which her hardships are due, and the inevitable way out of them.

As mothers and wives of the human race, women possess a power which, when awakened, will hasten the emancipation of the working class. Comrades, if you will but think for a brief moment of the future generation of young Socialists born and reared by Socialist mothers, you will surely consider our efforts to enlist women into our ranks an absolute necessity.

The cause of woman's economic slavery may be traced, like that of the man, to private ownership of the means of production. We must arouse woman to the

gross injustice of her economic condition. We must induce the working woman to accept the theories and principles of Socialism, for that alone will ameliorate her condition.

THE WOMAN'S NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

The last National Convention assembled in May, 1908, elected a committee of five women to take charge of the propaganda of Socialism among women. The whole proceeding was a new phase in our National organization.

The newly elected committee found itself under great limitations and lack of autonomy. To this committee was intrusted the task of managing and regulating the work of organization among women, but it was given no means to carry out its mission. Thus it happened that much time and energy were wasted.

The committee was granted the privilege of putting a special Woman's National organizer in the field.

For a long while our correspondence was carried on by one of our members and only for the last few months has it been done through the National Office.

Its first action immediately after being elected was to appoint Comrade Prevey as Woman's National organizer. In accordance with the decision of the convention, she was assigned to make a tour of the four suffrage states. The next matter undertaken was the publication of Comrade Maynard's leaflet and the attempt to form local woman's committees in every well organized city, town and village. This action has since proved to be a great factor in arousing the interest in Socialism among women at large as well as in bringing the newly organized woman's trade union movement closer to our folds. In various centers of our Nation the local committees have distributed thousands upon thousands of leaflets pertaining to woman and her relation to Socialism, the leaflets having been published by different publishing firms on their own accord.

Next came the gathering of signatures for woman's enfranchisement. Many thousands of these lists have been filled by our party members and sympathizers and collected by the chairman of our committee, who then sent them in a bulk to the suffrage headquarters. Some of our comrades may be skeptical as to the advantages gained by this action, and we wish to remind them that the Woman's National Committee had accompanied the petition lists with a letter to the comrades urging them to make the gathering of signatures at the same time a means of advocating Socialism. And in many instances the comrades followed out our recommendations.

A little later came the inauguration of Woman's Day—an action that has gained us the respect of our enemies and the approval of every liberal minded man and woman. Then came the printing of Comrade Stern's leaflet and the organization of study clubs, conducted under the supervision of the local committees. Comrade Anna Maley was elected Woman's National organizer, and the efficiency and success of her work is known to every comrade of the party. During the time Miss Maley has been in the field she has visited 152 towns and 125 local committees have been organized.

The New York Woman's local committee has done splendid work for our movement in taking an active part in the shirtwaist makers' strike, which fact has caused thousands of brave young women to regard the Socialist party with a feeling of kinship. Our committee has a uniform program of study in the Socialist Sunday schools under consideration, and we are also engaged in compiling a suffrage booklet which, besides giving detailed information as to the rights granted to women in different localities, will contain some excellent material on Socialism. With this the Woman's National Committee reached the end of its term of office and deems it wise to present to the Congress assembled a number of recommendations which, if accepted, will serve as a guide for future action.

In conclusion, before presenting our recommendations, we wish to remind you that this is the first report on Socialist propaganda among women rendered before our National Conventions. The main achievement of the Woman's National Committee has been to stir up interest in Socialism among the women of our Nation, and though but partially accomplished by the committee, its work has been far reaching in its effect.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

We urge the Congress to elect seven well qualified women, Party members of long and good standing in their respective local organizations, to serve in the capacity

of Women's National Committee for the purpose of carrying on a special propaganda among women, always with the point in view of enlisting them in the Socialist ranks.

In order to facilitate the work of the newly elected committee, we urge the delegates assembled to grant greater autonomy to said body, as follows: The right to act upon unanimously accepted motions dealing directly with the agitation among women that would not in any way involve the prestige or principle of the Party at large.

That the correspondence of the committee be carried on through the National Office as it is at present; that the committee shall not be compelled to solicit funds for the purpose of carrying on their special agitation, but should from time to time have the right to apply to the National Executive Committee for the reimbursement of funds spent on actual propaganda work; that said committee upon disapproval of its action by the National Executive Committee should have the right to present the matter to the National Committee, this with the unanimous consent of the Women's National Committee.

That the delegates assembled urge their respective states to keep a woman organizer in the field, who should endeavor to spread the teachings and principles of Socialism not only among the wage-earning population, but to carry the same into the homes of our comrades. We urge the formation of local committees, where same were not formed as yet, so that we may carry on a systematic house to house propaganda throughout the Nation, as we have come to the conclusion that this is the only means of reaching woman in the home—she, of all women, has been the most neglected.

In order to be able to account for all the committees organized and work accomplished, we recommend that the secretaries of the respective woman's local committees send semi-annual reports to the chairman of the Woman's National Committee.

As a means of coming in closer touch with the economic movement, we urge that our women comrades join the various woman's trade union leagues wherever same are in existence. In every industrial centre we urge the election of a strike committee to be in readiness whenever any occasion for action appears, as the surest means of gaining the ear of the women in the trades lies in helping them during an economic struggle.

We also urge upon our women comrades the organization of women into unions wherever the opportunity presents itself, for the working girl at large is very often incapable of grasping the principles of Socialism at the first attempt, where she would be willing to do so were she used to the economic organization, which is really the first step of her awakening.

Woman's disfranchisement being a great factor in aggravating her economic dependence, we urge the Party to take more direct action in the matter of woman suffrage, which should, however, be carried on under Party supervision and advocated from Party platforms. As the first step in this line, we recommend that the clause of our National Platform dealing with equal rights, regardless of sex, be amended to read:

WHEREAS, Woman's position in industry is of a much lower status than man's as the direct result of her political disqualifications, and

WHEREAS, The Socialist Party is the direct representative of the working class, regardless of sex, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Socialist Party demands equal suffrage, regardless of sex, color or race, and pledges itself to work, advocate and agitate for it.

We recommend that the locals hold at least one meeting a month for the purpose of agitating the granting of suffrage to women. We urge the women of our local committees to speak on suffrage from the Socialist point of view at every opportunity—hold out and indoor meetings, spread literature and make Woman's Day, the last Sunday in February, a memorable event in the Party annals.

We recommend that the Sunday previous to Woman's Day be set aside for general distribution of literature, and that our delegates to the International Congress be instructed to propose the last Sunday in February as an International Woman's Day.

The end of this decade may see woman the political equal of man, but if this should be the case the majority of our female working population would still find itself unable to vote, not being naturalized citizens. In view of this possible impediment we recommend the formation of naturalization bureaus and the agitation among our foreign born women to take out their naturalization papers without much delay.

As the last but not least recommendation, we urge the woman's local committees to make an effort to bring in more social life into our Party organization. For the utter failure of this necessary function as a part of our Party life may account for the lack of interest displayed in Party work by some of our best comrades.

We recommend that the Woman's National Organizer be ex-officio member of this committee and that she be routed by the National Office with the approval of this committee.

MAY WOOD-SIMONS, *Chairman*,
WINNIE BRANSTETTER.
THERESA MALKIEL.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I move that this report be accepted.

DEL. BLOOR (Conn.): I wish to move a, substitute for one paragraph. It is:

"The modern Socialist movement began its political career with a demand for equal political rights for all adults, without distinction of class or sex, and the platform of our own party contains a specific pledge that the Socialists of America would engage in an active campaign for unrestricted and equal suffrage for men and women. This pledge was made in good faith and must be redeemed unequivocally and whole-heartedly. Our propaganda for the enfranchisement of women must be carried on, not spasmodically and perfunctorily, but steadily and enthusiastically. We must allow no opportunity for such propaganda to escape. Whether it be a legislative hearing, a public demonstration or discussion, the Socialists should range themselves on all occasions with the advocate of woman suffrage.

"In this country there is practically no movement for qualified suffrage. The American woman suffrage movement as a whole stands for full political rights for women, regardless of class and property qualifications. There is, therefore, less reason for us to conduct a separate campaign upon this issue than there is for our comrades in Europe, where the suffrage movement is to some extent conducted on class lines. While the Socialist Party should never merge its identity in any other movement, we should not place ourselves in a voluntary position of isolation, where the principles and aims of our party fully coincide with those of other organizations. We should heartily support the general movement of the women of America for their enfranchisement. In this case, as in many similar cases, Socialism must break through the narrow circle of our own organization and must penetrate

into the masses of the people as a living and vivifying social force."

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion is before the house to adopt this report. An amendment is offered, or a substitute for a part of the report.

DEL. OSBORNE (Calif.): The motion is made for the acceptance of the report without any motion as to the recommendations and it seems to me the recommendation of the other comrade is not in order. I offer the amendment to Comrade Simons' motion that the recommendations be taken up seriatim.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now properly is the acceptance of the report; and we are not yet passing on the recommendations.

DEL. LOWE (Kans.): I move as an amendment to the amendment that the substitute offered by Comrade Bloor be not substituted, but added to the report, and be included in the report.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): A point of order. The motion of Comrade Bloor is not an amendment, but is a long statement of fact, a statement of facts which we cannot make facts by merely stating them here and which we have no right to incorporate in this report whatever. Of course, I suppose we really have the right to do anything we choose; we have the right to make fools of ourselves.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are right.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: It would be foolish to make these statements signed by nobody a part of this report. In other words, this whole matter is out of order at this time—

DEL. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): It seems to me we are going at this very awkwardly. We ought to take this up seriatim. I think Del. Bloor's motion was out of order. The motion was to accept the report, not to adopt the report. I think we should accept the

report and then take it up as all the other reports have been taken up, and begin at the beginning. Accept the report in all fairness to the committee and then go, at its consideration in order and not jump at the end of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understood the motion was that the report be adopted. The motion now is that the report be accepted.

On motion the report was unanimously accepted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, comrades, the question is on the recommendations of the committee.

DEL. CASSIDY (N. Y.): I make the motion that this matter be taken up seriatim.

The motion was carried.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): The first recommendation has been read, and I move to amend that by adding:

"Such committee to make its own rules of procedure and to fill any vacancies which may occur within the committee between the date of its creation and the next convention of the party."

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to this amendment?

DEL. BRANSTETTER: I object to that amendment. I think the election of this committee should take place in this congress. I think it should only carry over until such time as the regular election can be held or to some specified time, which I hope the Constitution Committee will pass upon. We do not want to elect our own committee. The National Committee should not elect the committee, the membership of the Socialist Party should elect the committee.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I understand full well that the Constitution Committee is discussing this in detail.

DEL. WILSON (Calif.): As a member of the Constitution Committee I can say that a paragraph has been drafted that requires the election of seven well qualified women of the Socialist Party, by the membership of the Socialist Party of America, and there are other details which are not immediately at hand.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): It seems to me we are wasting time on that. I suggest that all recommendations pending here be referred to the Constitution Committee, to save double discussion—that is, if they belong with that committee—in order that we may not discuss them now and then again when they come back from the Constitution Committee.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I am willing to have these taken up one by one,

but I think we are chasing round and round in a circle. Now, if we refer these matters to the Resolutions Committee and the Constitution Committee, they may not make a report until the last thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suggest that we follow Comrade Goebel's proposition and that the men sit still for a while. They are the ones specially interested in this; let them handle this.

DEL. WILSON: I have looked over these recommendations and as a member of the Constitution Committee I do not see that there is anything here that would naturally come before us. They would naturally come before this meeting.

COM. MALKIEL: I am a member of the woman's national committee and I want to oppose this motion to wait and elect this committee later. We have a committee now, and why should we wait three or six months before we get a committee? You ought to have a committee at work right now. I suggest that we go ahead and select seven members in this congress right now.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are any alterations to be made to this recommendation—

DEL. COLLINS (Colo.): Is the old committee a committee of seven members?

COM. MALKIEL: Five.

THE CHAIRMAN: The election of the committee can be taken up later. Let us proceed with these recommendations.

DEL. COLLINS: I believe the new draft that we have worked on for the Constitution makes this committee fifteen instead of seven. Why not continue the present committee until the election of a new committee?

DEL. O'HARE (Kans.): Delegate Collins is mistaken; the number was changed to seven.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the ladies know what they are about—

DEL. WORK (Ia.): I want to tell you the provision that has been adopted by the committee—

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it is understood; they know their business. If there is no objection the first recommendation is adopted. The secretary will read the second recommendation.

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): The second recommendation is as follows:

"In order to facilitate the work of the newly elected committee we urge the delegates assembled to grant greater autonomy to said body as follows: The right to act upon unanimously accepted motions dealing directly with the agitation among

women that would not in any way involve the prestige or principles of the party at large."

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection that will be adopted. There is no objection. It is so ordered. The next recommendation.

DEL. STREBEL: The third recommendation of the committee is as follows:

"That the correspondence of the committee be carried on through the National office as it is at present; that the committee shall not be compelled to solicit funds for the purpose of carrying on their special agitation, but should have the right from time to time to apply to the National Executive Committee for the reimbursement of funds spent on Propaganda work; that said committee, upon disapproval of its action by the National Executive Committee, shall have the right to present the matter to the National Committee, this with the unanimous consent of the Women's National Committee."

DEL. KLAUWER (Pol. Section): The foreign delegates have something like that in the hands of the Constitution Committee. Instead of going over this twice I think it would be advisable to give that point to the Constitution Committee. Then we can take it up together.

THE CHAIRMAN: You don't object to the congress adopting it? If you don't object, leave that where it is. Any other objections? Number three is adopted.

DEL. STREBEL: The fourth recommendation is:

"That the delegates assembled urge their respective states to keep a woman organizer in the field, who should endeavor to spread the teachings and principles of Socialism not only among the wage earning population, but to carry the same into the homes of our comrades. We urge the formation of local committees where same are not formed as yet, so that we may carry on a systematic house to house propaganda throughout the nation, as we have come to the conclusion that this is the only means of reaching the woman in the home—she who of all women has been the most neglected."

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that satisfactory? No objection. It is adopted.

DEL. STREBEL: The next recommendation, number five, is:

"In order to be able to account for all the committees organized and work accomplished, we recommend that the secretaries of the respective woman's local committees send semi-annual reports to the Chairman of the Woman's National Committee."

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objections? The suggestion is approved.

DEL. STREBEL: Number six is:

"As a means of coming in closer touch with the economic movement we urge that our women comrades join the various women's trade union leagues wherever same are in existence. In every industrial center we urge the election of a strike committee to be in readiness whenever any occasion for action appears, as the surest means of gaining the ear of the women in the trades lies in helping them during an economic struggle."

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objections? The suggestion is approved.

DEL. STREBEL: The next is number seven:

"We also urge upon our women comrades the organization of women into unions wherever the opportunity presents itself, for the working girl at large is very often incapable of grasping the principles of Socialism at the first attempt, where she would be willing to do so were she used to the economic organization, which is really the first step to her awakening."

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the section will be adopted. There is none. So ordered. Now this is where the suggestion of Comrade Bloor would come in.

DEL. BLOOR (Conn.): The reason for my substitute or addition is this: I simply want to make the report of the Woman's Committee as strong as the men's report on this subject of franchise. It seems to me we should adopt the position of Comrade Hillquit, when he says that we should have an unqualified and enthusiastic campaign for woman suffrage, just as the Socialists of Europe have helped the women of Europe in their efforts for universal suffrage. It seems that we should have more than is contained in this mere statement in the report. We should have a recommendation that we do as our comrades in New York have been doing, co-operate with this working girls' movement; we should, as we go through the other states, have this National Woman's Committee report to strengthen us in our work for woman suffrage. I find in my work in the Socialist Party and as a member of the party for fourteen years that in spite of the fact that we have this in our programme, I find that the women are not yet considered in a practical way fully a part of the body politic. I feel everywhere in working in the woman movement with women, that we want more support than ever before, because we are

deprived of the right of political expression, and any movement for the enfranchisement of a class so deprived must be a revolutionary movement, and I claim that this suffrage movement needs an exceedingly revolutionary statement in its programme on this question.

DEL. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): I suggest that we have already accepted that proposition in Comrade Hillquit's report, which we have adopted. I suggest that the comrade put that in her own language for an addition to this recommendation. There is no need to have the same thing repeated in the same words in two reports. Now I take off my hat to Comrade Hillquit's language on this subject. It is strong and good. But I submit you can put your thought in as good and as strong language, and I don't like to have as part of the report something that has already been adopted by the congress.

DEL. MAYNARD (Colo.): I think that this should be offered as a separate resolution, acted upon separately, and I request that it be received without action at this time, and instead of being put in the report, that it be acted upon with the other resolutions. It will simplify the machinery of the thing. They tell us we need to repeat this, although we have already adopted it in Comrade Hillquit's report. Putting it in our report does not make it any more effective than it was in the other report. If you want it more effective, put it in a separate resolution.

COM. MALKIEL: (N. Y.): When Comrade Hillquit's report was accepted it was said that it was only for information. As I understand the ruling of the chair, his report was not adopted, otherwise we would have discussed it then.

DEL. BLOOR: I simply make the suggestion, that this be incorporated in the report for this reason. I feel that the woman's committee should have a proper resolution covering this matter. I want this as a part of the woman's committee because I feel that our woman's committee should give a revolutionary expression of our principles on this matter without in any way conflicting with the general party principles.

COM. MALKIEL: I want to say that while I will take off my hat to Comrade Hillquit on many occasions, I will not this time. If Comrade Bloor thinks that Comrade Hillquit's recommendation is more revolutionary I wish you would read his report and then the committee's statement. You can then judge for yourself. Comrade Hillquit says: "In this country there is practically no movement for qualified

suffrage. The American woman suffrage movement as a whole stands for full political rights for women, regardless of class and property qualifications. There is therefore less reason for us to conduct a separate campaign upon this issue than there is for our comrades in Europe, where the suffrage movement is to some extent conducted on class lines. While the Socialist Party should never merge its identity in any other movement, we should not place ourselves in a voluntary position of isolation, where the principles and aims of our party fully coincide with those of other organizations. We should heartily support the general movement of the women of America for their enfranchisement."

Here is the report of the Woman's National Committee: "Woman's disfranchisement being a great factor in aggravating her economic dependence, we urge the party to take more direct action in the matter of woman suffrage, which should, however, be carried on under party supervision, and advocated from party platforms. As the first step in this line we recommend that the clause in our National Platform dealing with equal rights regardless of sex be amended to read: 'Whereas woman's position in industry is of a much lower status than man's as the direct result of her political disqualifications, and whereas the Socialist Party is the direct representative of the working class, regardless of sex therefore be it resolved, That the Socialist Party demands equal suffrage, regardless of sex, color or race, and pledges itself to work, advocate and agitate for it.'"

I wonder which is the more revolutionary? Whether we should go to work with a suffrage party to gain the vote or whether we should work through the Socialist Party to gain the vote?

Now, comrades, if we believe in the class struggle, if we, as Socialists, recognize the antagonism between the classes, we cannot lose ourselves in any middle class suffrage movement. Comrade Bloor tells you she has worked fourteen years in the party; but I have worked longer than that. Besides, I have worked many years in the industrial movement. In going to the working girls you cannot give them many theories at one time. We ought to be glad and we are glad if they take one at a time. It takes all we can do to teach her that her interests can never be identical with those of her employers. It takes a long time to get that one idea into her head. When we talked of the class struggle to the

strikers in New York they asked us, "Which is right. One hour you tell us our interests can never be identical with those of our employers and then the next we are told we must all work together." The woman's mind among the working class is in that state that she cannot get these two conflicting ideas. If you tell the working woman one moment that we must fight for Socialism, that that is her only salvation; and the next minute you tell her we are all sisters together—this is a sex struggle, let us all work together to get the vote—you mix her up and you won't get her for anything. You must remember that we don't merely want to get the vote for the working women; we want them to know how to use the vote when they get it.

The woman question to-day is something more than a mere sex question. The number of women in industry is growing daily. Already we have six million women among our wage earning population. Woman is man's greatest competitor in the labor market. The Socialist Party must deal with her as such. We have spent four days arguing about a possible Japanese invasion. Woman's invasion is here already. It is our duty as the representatives of the working class to argue with her and get her to become a member of the class conscious proletarian movement. Many of our comrades do not realize yet what a powerful factor in the economic situation woman labor really is. And it is time we woke up and considered this.

I have often been accused of being a womanist. My contention is that I am a Socialist first to last, but a woman nevertheless. Naturally enough, having been born a woman, my sympathies go out specially to the working woman as a portion of the general exploited working class. As a woman I do not want to wait for the vote until we get the Socialist millennium. I want it right now, to-night, if I could get it. I will naturally do all in my power to get enfranchisement for women, but I shall always do so as a Socialist, keeping in mind that woman's present degradation and subjection will only be changed under a different system of society, and that her enfranchisement is only one means to that end.

The contention of our committee was, that we should not lose our identity in working for suffrage, which would surely be the case if we should co-operate with the middle class suffragists. Why go and speak under restrictions from Mrs.

Belmont's platform, when we can speak freely from our own and under our own party supervision? If you do this, you will find that every time you gain a suffragist you gain a Socialist.

DEL. O'HARE (Kans.): It seems to me that once more in this discussion we have seen the question presented from the standpoint of the conditions as they exist in different sections of the country. Comrade Malkiel objects to this substitute or amendment, and I think she does so largely because her experience in the section of the country from which she comes leads her to do so. My experience in the section of country from which I come does not lead me to do so. All through the west and southwest I find it is not impossible at all for a Socialist to go in and take an active part in the woman suffrage movement without sacrificing her Socialist principles in the slightest degree. I find that I can work in that woman suffrage movement, but I always lay stress upon the fact that only through the Socialist movement can we have a universal suffrage that will mean anything, a suffrage that won't shut out, as it does in many parts of the south the poor white man who cannot pay his poll-tax, I would like to have this amendment carried. I want the opportunity—I want the authority for going before the woman's suffrage movements of the west, and the southwest, and with this amendment I shall have it.

In Europe, wherever there is a fight for universal manhood suffrage, the Socialist Party of Europe has gone into those movements and helped them. I cannot see any difference between a fight for universal manhood suffrage and a fight for universal suffrage for both sexes.

Comrade Malkiel makes the suggestion that these suffrage movements are being organized by the political parties of New York. Very well. If the Democratic party of Kansas and Oklahoma is seeking to organize a woman suffrage movement I want to be in that movement. I can get the platform just as often as any other woman of that organization, and I say the Socialist woman has everything to her advantage and nothing against her when she goes into the woman suffrage organizations of the United States. I believe in being a member of these woman suffrage organizations. I believe in co-operating with them in every way that I can so long as I do not compromise the principles of Socialism. I am a

member of the Woman's Trade Union League. I believe in getting in there. I believe in making myself a part of it. In Kansas City, it is the fact that there is one member who is in the habit of speaking, as a general thing, and that member is Mrs. O'Hare. And when they want a speaker they generally select me to do the speaking. I don't care what subject they give me to speak on, I can always bring it right back to the Socialistic basis. I don't care whether they talk on the marriage question, or on the comet, I will bring the comet back to the Socialist proposition. Anywhere, any time, I am going to get my say when I want it.

DEL. ESTHER LAUKKI (Minn.): When Mrs. Wilshire invited a lot of women to a swell hotel in Chicago to a birthday party and tried to organize a Progressive League I told her it did not pay for a Socialist woman to try to organize the women who kept their maids; whom we want to organize is the girl who is working in the kitchen; that is the girl we want. I think the object in getting me to that party was to kind of smooth me down because they thought I was too revolutionary. Afterwards I received letters from Mrs. Wilshire and some others asking me to write some pamphlets to the working girls.

When we organized this woman's committee at the last convention, we thought that was the best thing to break up this Progressive League and to organize those women into the Socialist Party; and I think we ought to praise them for the work they have done.

I will go back to the Bible and I will tell you that a man cannot serve two masters. It is utterly impossible. If Mrs. O'Hare can go before those wealthy women and make them understand that what is a benefit for them is a benefit for the others, then she does not belong to us. Do you think that the bourgeois woman does want a vote when she advocates it? Then let her come here with us. We want the vote, and we want to get the girls to understand that they have nothing to gain by joining the suffrage league of the United States. If those women do say that you are all right, because you do sign your name to a petition for a vote, and you are present at certain mass meetings, you won't get her vote when she gets it. Oh, those bourgeois women will be kind to the girls. Perhaps they will give their hired girls their worn out gowns, or when they have a meeting they will get them all

there for that one evening. But what will they do? What will they say to those girls the next morning? They will tell the girl: "Now we are going to have the vote, you must remember, that if you vote for Socialism they will do this and this; if you vote for Socialism we won't let you have your job." They will be training our women voters. You think you will get their votes? They will cheat you out of them. They will put something through the legislature that won't mean anything. I tell you, in Finland we have got the vote, we have got women in Parliament, but there was not a thing done by these bourgeois women. Not until the women of Helsingfors, the fish wives, the laundresses, the cooks, and the real workers got out and paraded on the street—not until then did we get any vote. For about twelve or fifteen years, as long as the Suffrage Association existed in Europe, it existed in Finland. We have had some of the most noted women. They were all of the bourgeois class; and they were all advocating woman suffrage. They edited papers; they organized leagues; they were eminent women; what did they do? When they saw that the working women were organizing they did all in their power to break them up. When the working girls wanted the vote they said they were decidedly against it. They said they did not want the vote yet. When the working women wanted it then the bourgeois women were against it.

This recommendation, presented by the Woman's Committee, is what we want. Don't accept anything from the bourgeois women. If you want to work for the real cause of the working women accept the Woman's Committee Report and do not accept the one presented by Comrade Hillquit.

DEL. LOWE (Kans.): It is a peculiar thing for me to be standing before an audience and making a suffrage speech. It is a thing I never did before in my life. When I stand before an audience it is for the purpose of making a Socialist speech. But it seems to me there is a place in a Socialist speech, and specially from the woman's standpoint, for the suffrage question. When we talk of leaving it entirely to the working women, as our comrade from Minnesota has suggested, I am opposed to it. I believe in appealing to women on every plane. I realize that there are women in every walk of life whose hearts are in earnest in regard to this great world wide move-

ment. It is not a Socialist matter with hundreds and thousands of these women; but nevertheless they are progressive; they really want to better humanity; and they are struggling to find the way in which they can do it best. And if we as Socialists can reach those women I say we should reach them.

DEL. ESTHER LAUKKI: That is what I say.

DEL. LOWE: I believe it is possible for Socialist women to take part in any organization, I care not where that organization may be, any organization of women. I believe, that if we ourselves can see the great goal before the Socialist, if we can always keep that clearly before us, that we can enter any organization and we can bring the women of that organization to a clearer understanding of this class struggle, and as she gradually realizes what this class struggle is, she will take her stand—in the interest of her class? Yes. But by far the greater number of the women belong to the working class. Do you realize that?

Comrades, I can but judge from my own experience. I do not come before you as a woman who has spent her life in the kitchen either, although I have every respect for the girls that do. It is but a matter of the accident of birth whether we spend our lives in the school room or in the parlor or the factory, or where we spend our lives. That is not a matter that can be criticised in any way. But wherever we find ourselves placed in life there is something for us to do in this great world struggle. I come before you as a teacher. All my life I have been in the school room. I know that life better than others. I know that there are thousands upon thousands of earnest women in the school room who see the child before them, and they want to understand that child, to understand how to bring about the best possible development of that child's life, so that they will best be able to serve the great cause of humanity. I say, if we can reach the teacher, why should we refuse to go to that teacher, no matter what organization she may be found in? I come before you to-night as seconding the amendment. I was very well satisfied with the Woman's Committee report; it was a very excellent report. I realize fully that our Woman's Committee has had a great task before them for the past two years. I do not believe we could have found within our national movement five women more earnest, more capable, better equipped to take up this

very important question and deal with it from a broad standpoint. I believe, that every woman on that committee has done her very best, and from personal experience I know that one or two have given many, many hours, and days, and weeks, and months to the earnest consideration of the various problems involved. I want to congratulate that committee on the success of their work; and I think that every member of the Socialist Party ought to be very proud of our Woman's Committee, but I do say this, comrades, if we can but keep our minds on the broader plane of this movement we shall achieve greater success. This is not a time to engage in personalities; this is a time when we should look at these things in the wider aspects of life. And as seconding this amendment—in spite of what Comrade Malkiel has said—I cannot see there is anything in this amendment to which we cannot all subscribe.

I seconded the amendment, because I thought it would be the means of avoiding this very clash that we have had here this evening. I did not want this discussion, this disagreement, just as we are entering upon this woman's movement in earnest; I did not want to precipitate this conflict on the woman's question; and for that reason I seconded the amendment. But I might just as well have remained in my seat, as I intended, and let the trouble go on.

DEL. LAUKKI (Minn.): I want to say to Comrade Lowe that I include the school teacher among the working women and I include all women who work for wages, whether they work in the field, the factory, the mine, the school room, or the office.

DEL. PREVEY (Ohio): Before I speak upon this question I want the chairman distinctly to understand that we women don't want any special privileges. If we take more than the ten minutes, I want you to call us to order. It must be just the same as with the men delegates. I want that distinctly understood. I am also sorry to see that the men are not taking a more active part in this discussion.

A DELEGATE: We were ruled out by the chair.

DEL. PREVEY: Your business at the present time is building a political party. For what purpose? To get possession of all the powers of government, and to change the ownership of the means of producing the necessities of life. That is

your business primarily. That is the only reason we are in existence. Now, as a member of that Socialist Party I don't want any fads or frills or isms. I want our congressmen and our mayors and our city councilmen to be perfectly free to do their work along that line. I do not want them hampered by any frills or fads. We have too much of that already. We are getting rid of some of our frills and fads. They are leaving us as the party progresses; and I am glad they are. That is why I am sorry the men are not taking part in this discussion, because they do not realize that their work as representatives of the Socialist movement may be hampered by some fad attached to them as representatives of the organization. I do not want our chairman to be hampered by the suffrage movement in the City of Milwaukee, and obliged to do certain things because a suffrage society says they should be done for that city. There are people in the city of Milwaukee who manufacture beer; the people there drink beer. Now, I am not an advocate of drink, but I do not want the Mayor of the city of Milwaukee compelled to take any particular stand on that.

And now to my point. I am well aware from recent experience that the W. C. T. U. has a suffrage department and many of those ladies belong to the Suffrage Society. Occasionally they get ready to clean up things in a municipality. They are going to do away with liquor drinking; going to do away with the social evil, and with everything else. Now, if we Socialists go on record as advocating co-operation with the Suffrage Society, we shall have to go out and do some investigating; and I don't want to do that. I am already obliged to pass on the morals of the members of the Socialist Party on this committee. That is enough.

Another thing; there is absolutely nothing in the report of the National Woman's Committee which prevents any Socialist woman from working in the Suffrage Society if she wants to. Nothing whatever. And I am perfectly in accord with the report of the National Woman's Committee for that reason. Why do we want any more? Is it going to make it any stronger? Decidedly not. I am perfectly free to take part in a debate on woman suffrage if they will give me a chance, but they are afraid of me. We had a fight in Akron recently and a prominent lady suggested that I be put on the programme, but I cannot talk from

their platforms. I am not going to ask for space on their platforms. And another thing, I have not got time for two movements. When the comrades in some other city say they want a speaker; that they have not got a speaker and will I come, I say, Yes; I want to put in my time that way. I want to be free to give all my strength, to give all my leisure time to the Socialist movement. I have no strength left for a bourgeois ladies' organization.

Does it give us any more authority to work in a suffrage association if we adopt this amendment? Decidedly not. I think the report of the National Woman's Committee is strong enough for me, and all the delegates know I want it pretty strong. I want it revolutionary; I want it clear on that point, so that we can go right ahead in close accord with our political party. I don't want to stand on the street corner and represent suffrage; I want to stand there as a Socialist, and I am going to stand there as a Socialist. And I don't want any frills tacked to me either. I hope I am going to talk at all times so that the members of the Socialist Party will be proud that I am a Socialist. For that reason I don't want any frills.

Now, comrades, I want the men to take part in this discussion. Let us hear from you. We have not voted yet. Comrade Hillquit may go to Congress next fall; Berger may go; there may be others. There will be other comrades go to Congress, I believe. I want them to go pledged simply to the working class. It is unnecessary for us as a political organization to adopt this amendment. We already have an amendment which says that we shall do all that we possibly can to obtain the vote for the wage working girls and women in order that they may be able to protect themselves as independent workers just the same as men.

Comrades, I am in favor of adopting the report of the committee just as it stands. And vote the amendment out of existence forever and ever.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I rise for information. If this woman's question is to be considered as a serious question, let us be serious. If we have reached that point that the part of woman in our movement is a joke, and a laugh, and a sneer, and only women are to take hold of it, then the membership of this congress has a long way to go. I want a ruling on this point. It is not only that I want to speak on this subject. But I

have risen several times, because I wanted that question put squarely before this congress whether the position of women in the Socialist movement is a joke, the subject of a laugh and a sneer, or is it an important part of our movement? Are they to be here because they are pretty things to look at, or because we as men are chivalrous? I know of no chivalry in the Socialist movement; I know only equality between Socialist women and Socialist men. I want to know whether the chair's ruling is the ruling of this congress.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know what the comrade is referring to.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: I refer to the fact that you said that none but women would be recognized. You have hinted repeatedly that this was to be left to the women. As soon as that suggestion was made I began to rise for recognition.

THE CHAIRMAN: I may say that my attention was called to the fact that Comrade Wentworth had risen several times and I had not noticed her.

DEL. SIMONS: If it was not done intentionally I have nothing to say.

DEL. BERGER: I want to say that she had risen half a dozen times and I went up and called the chair's attention to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us hear from Comrade Wentworth.

DEL. WENTWORTH (Mass.): I want to put in a word for the women of Massachusetts. As I understand it, the paragraph in the paper presented by the committee is in direct opposition to the amendment offered by Comrade Bloor, and I should like to state my reasons for being in favor of the amendment. I would rather have the paragraph as proposed in Comrade Hillquit's report than the paragraph of the committee's report. As I understand it, this paragraph of the Woman's Committee report means that Socialist women as a body shall not co-operate with suffrage societies. Am I right?

DEL. MAY WOOD-SIMONS (Ill.): You are not.

DEL. WENTWORTH: As I understand it, Socialist women may co-operate as individuals, but not as a part of the Socialist body?

DEL. MAY WOOD-SIMONS: Our interpretation is that individuals may co-operate, but that the Socialist Party should not commit itself to the principle of co-operation.

DEL. WENTWORTH: That is my understanding. And that is my point. I

believe in co-operation, as approved, as I understand it, by the amendment offered by Comrade Bloor, which is the paragraph taken from Comrade Hillquit's report. I want to be clear about this before I vote.

In this connection I should like to state something of the conditions in Massachusetts. We are getting into such harmonious relations, and are working so well together, that I should hate to have anything come up that would interfere with our working together in that way. Now my experience has been just the same as that of Comrade O'Hare in Kansas. I frequently speak for suffrage societies on my own terms, and my terms are that every time I take the platform or the street corner and state why I want the vote I may state also that I want it because I am a Socialist. And I make them a straight Socialist speech. I never trim one inch. And they know it. And instead of refusing to have me, they would take all my time if I would permit it. They wanted me for their big May Festival last Tuesday. That is quite a big thing for the Boston women and they quite insisted on my coming. I said I was coming here, but they knew perfectly well that if I took that platform that I should make a Socialist speech; they look to us for leadership and they are coming to do so more and more. They look to us as "the real thing." They came home from the Washington suffrage convention and they said that the best speech made there was by a Socialist. And if you will forgive the personal side of it I should like to show you how they are beginning to look for the Socialist interpretation of things, how they are beginning to see the economic side of it. We do not want to lose the ground that we have made. We are continually recruiting from their ranks, because we explain the Socialist position to them. This suffrage woman came to me and she said in confidence: "These other men say nice things about us, and say they believe in suffrage, but after all, they don't understand it; Wentworth"—meaning Comrade Franklin Wentworth—"we want him because he is a Socialist and he understands." And so the suffrage women, because we have talked Socialism to them, and shown them repeatedly the economic conditions which lie at the base of everything, they are turning to us as the leaders.

Another thing I ask you to remember is, that the wife of the bourgeois is

generally a far greater slave than the woman in the kitchen, washing dishes, because that woman gets her pay at the end of the week, while the wife—well, she is lucky if she gets any at all. She works for it and she asks for it, but she is the slave of a slave. So I believe the light of Socialism should be made to penetrate to every corner of the world from the top down and from the lowest up. They all need it; every one of them.

When we made our plea at the State House, of course, things turned out as we did not expect them, but it was not because we were Socialist women. The Socialist women were the largest group in this body of nearly a thousand women that passed through the State House before the committee, and there was a tremendous influx into that group of Socialist women. It was astonishing to see how they came into that group. So I say that in Massachusetts we are doing good work. We are glad to help on the cause of suffrage from the principle of justice, absolute, abstract justice. We know perfectly well that if the vote were given to-morrow to these women of the capitalist class, we know that a great many of them, most of them, perhaps, would vote for the capitalist parties. But that does not keep us from seeing the justice in the demand for the suffrage, in the abstract right of women to have the suffrage. So we know that in working for that we are making good headway for Socialism also, because we preach Socialist doctrines every time we get a chance. We preach the suffrage doctrine from that point of view.

So I hope the amendment will stand. Comrade Hillquit's expression is to my mind the broad and big policy and we shall make greater headway, it seems to me, if we adopt that, than if we limit the opportunities in this direction.

THE CHAIRMAN: If from the remarks of the chair as to women having the preference here in this discussion you can infer that the chair intended this to be regarded as a joke, then this very report is a joke, because it is signed by three women and not one man; and this whole proposition must be a joke, for it recommends that seven well qualified women—not men—not one man—seven qualified women shall be members of the committee. That is logic. Now the chair still holds that inasmuch as at the two preceding sessions the men were in the predominance, that in the discussion of this woman's question as presented by

this report of the Woman's National Committee composed of three women, and under which a committee of seven women is to be elected, I still think it is no more than fair to give the women the preference to some extent in this discussion. If you think that is a joke, make the most of it. I resent such a remark.

DEL. SIMONS: It is not a woman's question alone that we are discussing.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that well.

DEL. SIMONS: I want the men to take part in it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, comrades, the party has allowed three women to handle it for the past two years. A number of the women delegates have asked for the floor and have not yet spoken. I do not see why they should not be given the opportunity to comment on the work of these other women. If Comrade Simons has asked for the floor repeatedly I do not object to granting it.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: As I have already said, I do not believe the question we are discussing now is any more peculiarly a woman's question than is the question of immigration. I say that this is a question that affects the entire working class. I say that the attitude of the chair and those who support him in that, is the very attitude that lies at the base of woman's present position. But I am not going to enter into an argument on that. I am going to talk on this question. It is a question that interests me thoroughly. The question of woman suffrage interests me greatly. I do not believe you can have a proletariat that is half slave and half free. I do not believe the working class can vote its way to political dominion with one of its halves disfranchised and enslaved. I go out to the working class and try to convert them to Socialism, because their hands are bound, and until their hands are freed my hands will remain bound; and in the same way, when I go out and preach woman suffrage it is because of the fact that so long as one half of the race is enslaved the other half cannot be freed.

Now for a few words on the merits of this question. I believe there is a wider sweep to this question than many of us are now willing to admit. One of the reasons assigned by one of the closest students of American conditions for the backwardness of the Socialist movement in this country is partly the way in which suffrage was gained by men in this

country. I am supported by practically every authority in Europe on this matter; and that is that the bourgeois of America, abetting the bourgeois little capitalist class that gained the Revolutionary struggle, granted the vote to the working class, not as a class right, not as the result of a class fight, but as a favor. And Comrade Berger and Comrade Hillquit and the learned men who know the European situation will agree with me, that the reason it is so difficult to arouse the workers of this country to use the suffrage is, because they did not win it; did not fight for it and take it, and because it was given to them. Do you think the German workers that walked in the streets of Berlin, that gathered in Treptow Park—do you think that when they get the ballot they are going to use it as the American workers use it? Does the Hungarian use it as the American? No; because he attained it after a fight with the Austrian as a class right, and recognizes it not as an end in itself, but as a means to an end. The ballot is not something of value in itself. It is what the anarchist says it is—only a piece of paper; but in the hands of a revolutionary class the ballot is the means by which we can gain control of the state and use the state for our own purposes. Do we propose to have the women follow the same pathway that has been fraught with such disaster to the men? Do we propose to have the Belmonts and the Morgans hand them the suffrage as a favor when they see that they are threatened by an ever growing working class movement, so that they may lead the people to whom they have given the suffrage against us on the field of political action, when we want to fight for better conditions for all workers?

Now you are proposing to turn over this power to those who control the Civic Federation; to the meanest, shrewdest, sharpest, cleverest capitalist class the world has ever known. They know what they are doing when they organize the Woman's Suffrage organization. They know what they are doing when they organize the Sick and Death Benefit system. They know, when they see the working class about to take anything, and that they cannot be stopped, that it is better that they should seem to hand it to them as a favor; and if in so handing them this favor they can absorb the organization of the proletariat, and substitute for that organization an organization that cuts across the class lines, they will make the revolution we are seeking infinitely more

difficult. These are facts that you better understand, both men and women. They are not so insignificant.

Europe has been referred to here.

(At this moment, on motion of Delegate Berger, the time of adjournment was fixed at 10:30 instead of 10 o'clock.)

I was greatly surprised to hear comrades here advocating going into any place and among any class and teaching the class struggle. I can hardly believe that by going into the parlor of J. Pierpont Morgan that we can preach the class struggle with any degree of success. I believe we are taking hold of something here that is deeper and more important than many of us realize. It they were going in the State of Illinois to submit an amendment to the constitution granting the suffrage to all women, I say that the place for every Socialist would be out upon the streets, out in the houses and the shops and the mills, the factory and the mine, taking part in that fight with all their powers without regard to who might be fighting by your side. But, if it becomes a question whether we are going to build up organizations approved by the Belmonts, approved by the Morgans, approved by all those forces that have crushed the labor unions whenever they have had the power, approved by the forces that have made up the record of Homestead and a long line of horrors, leaving a trail of blood down the line of American history; if the question comes between helping to build up such an organization and building up an organization of the working men and women of the land, my voice and vote will always be on the side of building up the true proletarian organization.

COM. LENA MORROW LEWIS (Calif.): It seems to me there is one point that we should get clear on. We cannot introduce into this country the same arguments that have been presented by Comrade Simons relative to the situation in Europe. We are not dealing with the conditions that exist in Europe. We are dealing with the conditions that exist here in America. In the political activities of the people of this country the ballot is the means whereby they function. We are face to face with the situation that one half of the people of this country possess the ballot and the other half are dispossessed. So far as this particular issue is concerned let us draw a line right down this middle aisle, and we shall assume that the men are on this side and the women are on this side. Over on this side are

capitalist men and working men; and the thing that they have in common is the ballot; and over on this side are the working women and the capitalist women; the thing they have in common is their lack of the ballot. The question rests not upon the right of the women upon this side to possess the same right that the men already have on that side. We are agreed upon that point. The question before us is, how shall we go about it to secure the enfranchisement of this side of the house, namely, the women? How do we get the ballot? Do we get it by any action of the Socialist Party? Has the Socialist Party to-day any power to enfranchise women? If every last man of the Socialists stood to-day for woman suffrage they could not give it to us as a technical fact. They may favor it; they may speak for it; but they have not the power to give it to us. How do we get the ballot then? The method by which the ballot is given to any people is by amendments and changes in constitutions. And we must proceed by the ballot to secure the right to extend the franchise. Now, on the question of getting the ballot the women can agree and stand as a unit, and when that part has been secured, and when all have the ballot, men and women alike, when that has been accomplished then the division begins to come along the class line, and then the line is drawn across instead of up and down and over there we have the capitalist men and the capitalist women and over here the working men and the working women. You can't draw the class line effectively until you have obliterated the sex line politically.

The argument has been advanced that if the ballot is secured by co-operation with the bourgeois class that they alone will use it. I insist that working women will accept the Socialist philosophy in about the same proportions as the working men. And that Mrs. Belmont and Mrs. Morgan can no more control the women of the working class when once they get the ballot, any more than the same Belmont-Morgan crowd can control the men of the working class. If there is anything lacking it is possibly in our not having good propaganda among the women, and it is not a question of whether the Belmont crowd will capture the working women, it is up to us to present such a superior kind of propaganda that the Belmonts can have absolutely no effect upon it.

Again the bourgeois women, many of them, have not the same keen sense

of the class struggle as have the men of that class. They have not had the experience in the business world; and the cause of this fact is that woman is psychologically more social than man, because from a biological viewpoint her nature is social. The fact is evidenced in the women's clubs of the country. Look at their programmes. What do you find? What are their subjects? The women's federations always take up public and civic and social questions. In New Orleans the question arose whether or not they should have a new sewerage system, and the men of the city voted it down by a large vote, and then the women got busy and they said "We want the right of franchise," and when those bourgeois women of New Orleans went to the polls they carried the proposition to introduce a new sewerage and water system, and the result is that New Orleans has reduced her death rate remarkably on account of that fact. The motive power back of that was the social instinct of the women, that seeks to protect society, because she saw farther than the men did. I recognize the fact that the woman in the business activities of life may find that economic conditions overcome the social instinct, but we have this advantage, that woman's nature is at its basis a social nature. This distinction is seen even in children. Little girls begin early to play social games; while boys begin just as early to play competitive games.

We should put ourselves clearly on record so that the women suffrage people cannot point to us and say, "You are against suffrage, because you have adopted a resolution against it."

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): I should not have taken part in this discussion were it not for the fact that the proposed amendment happens to be taken from my report. I cannot therefore help but be in sympathy with this measure; but I doubt whether it was quite wise to introduce it in this form at this time. But as the question is up it is just as well to settle it on its merits.

Now, there is one thing I warn you against, comrades, and that is deciding a thing one way or the other upon a catchword, co-operation, independence, and so on. We don't want that. We want to know in what way this amendment changes the original motion. Then we shall know whether we

should adopt it or not. For instance, Comrade A. M. Simons, who was the only excitable lady that we have had on the floor here, and who spoke so violently—comrade, did you read the proposed amendment?

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: You bet I read it; read it when it came off the type; read it in the Daily Socialist; and read it again tonight.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I take your word for it. Now, this amendment says that while we should never merge our identity in any other movement we should not place ourselves in a voluntary position of isolation, where the aims and principles of our party fully coincide with those of other organizations. We should heartily support the general movement of the women of America for their enfranchisement. Now when you speak of co-operation in the sense of merging our identity you speak of something not before you.

DEL. SIMONS: Perhaps you better read that report; it is very interesting.

DEL. HILLQUIT: (Reading.) "In this case Socialism must break through the narrow circle of our own organization and must penetrate into the masses of the people as a living and vivifying social force." Let me tell you what I mean by that. I never for one moment forgot that we are a Socialist Party.

DEL. SIMONS: I must insist that you read that amendment. You have not read it at all.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I will read the entire thing if the chair will not deduct it from my time.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I shall have to do that.

DEL. HILLQUIT: Now that there may be no sort of suggestion of unfair play I shall read it from beginning to end. (Reads paragraph from Report on Propaganda, relating to woman suffrage.)

Now, by this I mean precisely what it states. I mean that as a Socialist Party we have a Socialist philosophy and we stand for Socialism. As a Socialist organization this committee has two objects: propaganda of Socialism and working for woman suffrage. Socialist propaganda first and woman suffrage next. Where are we to make that propaganda? I will say to my dear Comrade Theresa Malkiel that if she came all the way from New York

to make a propagandist speech on woman suffrage to Socialists only, she might as well have stayed in New York. What we want for all our propaganda is what this amendment says: to go out to the world and preach it to the masses and preach it to the masses outside the party.

DEL. MALKIEL: Don't we say so too?

DEL. HILLQUIT: If the comrade believes there is no distinction, let us reverse the question and ask why do they so strenuously object? Our good friends answer us; we want you to do it as individuals, but not as an organization. Why, if it is good work when done by the individuals, does it become bad work when it is done by the organization? We do not stand for fusion; we do not for one moment suggest that our committees obliterate themselves; or that they take instruction from any one but the proper Socialist organization. But let me say that there are certain general movements of general scope. Say, for instance, there is the circulation of a petition in Illinois. What position in such a movement shall our Socialist woman's committees take? Shall they stand aside, or shall they throw the weight into the mass and lead the mass if possible into Socialism?

This is not a novel proposition. It does not apply to women alone. It applies to every other part of our policy. Comrade Simons justly laments that we are isolated from the working class. He laments that we are not fighting the battles of the working class although we are a working class party. We do not go with them in their legislative fights or their strikes, and so on. He says we should. I say we should. I say we should join with every movement of progress that is in the line of revolutionary Socialism, but always as Socialists, always sounding the message of Socialism. But going with the outsiders for that particular purpose.

As to woman suffrage, we have a certain pride in that movement. We are the first propagandists of it in this country. We have a lot of imitators. Shall we now, when the movement grows rapidly, leave it to the bourgeois women? I say our policy in this as in every other movement should be the same, and just as this report expresses it, break through the narrow circle of our own organization. And if any one

for a moment considers that this is an abandonment of the revolutionary, class conscious principles of Socialism, he has another guess coming to him. This is the only effective way of making revolutionary Socialists. You can't make revolutionary Socialists by passing resolutions in our own halls. You can only make revolutionary Socialists by going to the masses of the people and preaching revolutionary Socialism on every occasion. And so the duty of our committee is first of all to carry the message of Socialism as our committee, as an organization, and the suffrage agitation furnishes plentiful opportunity for that purpose.

I say once more, never for one moment compromise your Socialist principles, but you should not place yourselves in a voluntary position of isolation. What does that mean? Why do you object to it?

DEL. D'ORSAY (Mass.): The committee's report does not prevent comrades as individuals from joining in a suffrage movement, or co-operating with a suffrage organization, but it seems to refrain from putting the party in the position of endorsing the policy advocated by the amendment. Comrade Hillquit is an old Socialist, and considers it would not be proper for the Socialist Party to go into any fusion. But there are certain localities where the women are not so well up in the Socialist philosophy as Comrade Hillquit, and where such organizations come in conflict with the Socialist Party. I have known some places in Massachusetts where the suffrage movement in the municipal election supported either Democrats or Republicans. I could not as a Socialist be a member of such an organization. And there are dozens of cases where they go to work and help to elect a Democrat or a Republican. A Socialist who was a member of such an organization would have to withdraw. Remember, this report does not prevent Comrade Wentworth from speaking with or for a suffrage organization. But I as a worker in the Socialist Party since its inception have never found it possible to consistently co-operate in a suffrage organization. I have been asked in my home town of Lynn over and over again to become a member of the suffrage association, but I have said that I as a consistent Socialist could not join their organization. Time and again things were

coming up that would conflict with my ideas, with my conception of what a consistent Socialist ought to be.

Some of these suffrage organizations are more liberal than others. The suffrage organization in Lynn was supposed to be the most liberal you could find in Massachusetts. A year ago there was a fight for free speech. One of our Socialist comrades was a member of that organization, but at all times a Socialist. When we went before the commission there were two Socialists there and seven members of the Suffrage Association. And some one said, "Where are your red flags?" and the president and several members of the association said: "We don't want any red flag or Socialist truck here. We won't have them." So I say the committee report should be adopted and the amendment voted down.

DEL. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): I am heartily in favor of the amendment, but not as a substitute for any portion of the report. I wish to say this is not a question of whether Mrs. Belmont is in a suffrage movement. This is a question of the attitude of a national body to a national body. I suspect there are very few of you people have read the declarations of the National Woman's Suffrage Association of America. I am struggling for my class in the political organization of the Socialist Party, and struggling for suffrage for women within that organization. I am a member of that National Association. In lining up with them on the suffrage question I do not give up one of my Socialist principles, because there is not one thing in the declaration of the National Suffrage Association which I cannot endorse. That association has always stood for unlimited, unqualified suffrage for women. No one here can point to a single resolution where that is denied. They declare unqualifiedly for universal woman suffrage for America.

Now, you men here should not be so sex conscious. This question should interest the men of the party as much as the women. There are issues here which we ought to meet and which we must meet. They are important issues. They relate to the line in which we are to work to get the greatest progressive benefits for the working class; and if we are to work for the working class we must take up

the struggle of the working class. If you favor woman suffrage you must study every organization that deals with that subject. Now in fairness to the National Suffrage Association it does not make any difference if there is a Mrs. Belmont belongs to it. It is their declaration of principles that counts; their official declaration. It is the official attitude of the national organization that is important. I do not know nor do I care what Mrs. Belmont has done in New York City, but I do know what the Suffrage Association has done in Oklahoma. I speak for the western section of the country. I know the sentiments there. While there may be more industrial workers in New York I wish to say that we have a strong organization in Oklahoma and that association is standing for unlimited, unqualified suffrage, and I don't care whether they have a Mrs.

Belmont in there or not. And the Socialist Party of Oklahoma has co-operated with that association and with the result that we have an initiative petition before the legislature; we secured nine thousand signatures, more than enough to support our petition. In that co-operation I have not given up one of my Socialist principles. Nor does any individual in Oklahoma deny that I am a Socialist. In mass meetings we have co-operated; and the result of it is that there is an assurance among all classes that the Socialist Party is for the working class first, but always for woman suffrage. I hope when you decide upon this question you will decide fairly, not with reference to one locality, but with reference to the whole question.

The congress then adjourned to May 19, 1910.

FIFTH DAY'S SESSION.

Secretary Roewer called the Congress to order at 9:30 A. M.

Delegate John G. Willert, of Ohio, was elected Chairman for the day.

After the correction of two minor errors in the printed minutes of Tuesday's session, the minutes were approved.

REPORT OF WOMAN'S COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN: The business before the house now is the motion by Delegate Ella Reeve Bloor, who moved to insert a part of Comrade Hillquit's report, page 8, the first two paragraphs, in the Woman's Report.

DEL. MAYNARD (Colo.): I wish to move as a substitute for the amendment the following:

SUBSTITUTE FOR AMENDMENT TO REPORT OF THE WOMAN'S COMMITTEE.

Whereas, In three states at the present time suffrage amendments are pending,

Resolved, We urge upon our comrades in these states the utmost concentrated effort to secure victory at this time, and that we shall expect officials of the National party to assist to this end in every way in their power.

Whereas, In all states, there is an ardent and progressive woman's movement working for unrestricted suffrage,

Resolved, That we hereby express hearty sympathy with this movement and our pleasure in whatever common activity individuals, locals, or the general party find consistent with the fullest service to the Socialist cause; provided, it involve no organic affiliation.

Whereas, However, the one supreme guide to prompt and permanent progress is the class struggle of the workers,

Resolved, That our supreme interest and energy must be centered upon the education and the organization of the women workers in factory, office, school or household and the wives of the working class and Socialist comradeship everywhere.

DEL. MAYNARD: I want to remark

on the amendment, that there are two things in relation to this movement to accomplish if we can. One is this: We should avoid needlessly antagonizing anyone.

Often our essential principles force us to stand in isolation. This is all right when necessary, of course; but when we can fellowship with our neighbors we should be glad to do so.

Prejudices against us are tremendous at best; why add to them when not essential?

I had felt this report to be simple in itself, as it in no way seeks to prevent such co-operation with suffrage societies as may be found expedient.

However, this discussion here convinced me that this specific recognition of such joint demonstration as can be arranged is desirable. It will discourage the bigotry which is too apt to assert itself with no warrant from principle.

It is too easy for us to separate ourselves from the community. For example, this spring in Denver, we have had pending a water franchise and direct legislation and recall amendment. One party was pledged to all of these things, of course, yet instead of entering into the fight whole-heartedly, we grudging even a mention of these issues at our meetings.

So afraid are we of agreeing with our neighbors on anything. This spirit is all wrong. We should be glad to work in common cause where we can fully endorse a measure and where no organic or political affiliation is required.

These matters are trivial compared with our great goal, of course, but they have to be met from time to time and for Socialists to be indifferent and half-hearted is to stir up prejudice and do more harm than years of teaching can overcome.

This suffrage question is one of our demands which will be always to the front. This year it is to be settled, in all probability for years to come, in three states.

In Dakota full suffrage referendum is before the people for direct vote. The Socialists should head the fight. It will

not be a question of co-operation with the suffragists there. They will not want our help as Socialists, but the party should work on its new lines and harder than the others.

Our organizer, Anna Maley, has been there. She worked hard for the suffrage amendment, but the suffragists themselves were afraid of her, lest her Socialism should frighten the voters.

Here the two forces must work separately and I only hope the Socialists will work to such good purpose, that they will win this great measure for the Dakota women, whatever the suffragists may do.

It is their cause and when it is right before them, as it now is, the party could well afford to give it supreme attention all the campaign. As a working class measure it has first place at such a time.

It shows we are still academic on the question that although suffrage is pending in some form in these states this very season, no mention is made of that fact.

The other phase of the question I intend to emphasize is one in which I am in full agreement with the committee's report.

Whatever work may be forcible in association with suffrage or other movements, the women of the party should not be given an idea that such co-operation is more than an incident.

The Women's Committee would soon be discouraged if they fancied their success lay in winning women's clubs or suffrage societies for Socialism.

When they can teach Socialism to prosperous women of leisure they should be glad to do so, but the chief work must lie with the working class. There lies the path of least resistance.

Remember, one of the most important groups is the women teachers.

Chicago is away ahead of most cities in the class consciousness of its teachers, and they will form a large proportion of a support which we may expect. For we do not want our Socialist women to think that when we say working class we mean simply shop girls or factory girls, but we mean working women everywhere, teachers, women on the farms and everywhere, women of the producing class that we have to win in this great army if we ever gain a victory. So that I present this amendment as something that definitely states the two things that we want to have understood.

First, we want to have no antagonism, no objection to any kind of work anywhere unless it involves the essential, sa-

cred things in our party. On the other hand, we want it to be so plain that he who runs may read; that if you want to do the most with your energy in a given time, you must work where there is the least resistance, among those people who have everything to gain and nothing to lose by our proposition, although we have a kindly feeling for the others. Socialist women should all understand the splendid message of the class struggle and economic emancipation. Socialism and suffrage can never be of co-ordinate importance to one who sees the tremendous forces at work. Our women should see that economic pressure is the dynamics of history. We should be united on the essentials of our working class philosophy. Not as a creed.

Someone has said "A creed is all right as a guide board, but it is too often taken as a hitching post."

We want our class struggle to be not a hitching post, but a guide post, something that will guide us on to a sure, sane, careful path of progress, always toward the full freedom of all humanity.

DEL. BLOOR: I accept the substitute.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the second willing to do so?

The substitute was accepted by the second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then this will be incorporated in the first amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further remarks?

DEL. ATWOOD (S. D.): I merely wish to make one remark, and that is that South Dakota endorses the position of the delegate who has just spoken.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I will not attempt to speak on this question, but I want to say that I consider that Comrade Simons last night raised this question from the plane of maudlin sentiment to the plane where it belongs. The fact of the matter is that there is a good deal of effort in the Socialist Party and a good deal of unconscious feeling on the part of the men of the Socialist Party to regard the women in the party and the woman's movement as a joke. I want to say, with all kindness and cordiality to the comrades who expressed that idea, that I believe it is not very fair. I sat still, smiling in silence, and listened while the women spoke to the point. I want to say that the day is past in the Socialist Party when there should be insinuations or inferences that the women in our movement or the women as a sex ought

to be poohed and ridiculed. The fact of the matter is that underneath the proposition to substitute, that was made last night, there is a settled feeling of the idea of chivalry, the idea that this woman question has got to be treated on a different basis than any other question. You can say what you please, you can make the statement as plausible as you want to, but the fact still remains that that is the case. Underneath it all there is a proposition and suggestion here that we should deal with it on a different basis than we would if the question were one of manhood suffrage. What would this Congress think if a proposition was brought in here that on a question of manhood suffrage we were going to endorse indirectly a political organization and go outside of the Socialist Party? We know what we would do. And yet it was argued on the floor of the congress last night—indirectly, I will admit, but nevertheless just as directly as I am saying it now—there was an argument proposing practically that we would endorse an organization as an organization, but could not affiliate with it but as individuals. Comrades, I want to say that it is unsocialistic to propose such a proposition, and I am amazed that the suggestion should have been made last night at all. I do not believe that we ought continually to be permeated by one idea in this movement or by one set of comrades, no matter how loyal and sincere they may be, and I want to protest against the conduct at times of some comrades in this party, prominent in the organization, continually insisting that their view on a proposition is practically the only view, even to the extent of approaching the chair and influencing the selection of speakers. I say that without any personal feeling whatever, but I think there is a feeling in the party against this business, and I recommend to the comrades that if these tactics were not resorted to a great deal of friction would be avoided on this woman question. The same proposition that was raised on the immigration question, I prophesy, is going to be raised on the land question, but there is an undercurrent against the whole business. You may think I am unfair, but I do not say it in a spirit of personality. I say it simply because I think the best interests of the party would be subserved if the proposition was put up to the comrades that the delegates to this Congress simply come here representing the party, and the officers of this organization should submit their propositions and retire, because they have no right to

come forward and insist on their proposition being considered exactly from their particular viewpoint; and I want to say, comrades, when that spirit has begun to permeate the members of this organization, in my judgment the Socialist Party will begin to grow a great deal faster than it is growing at the present time. I do not say that with any personal feeling whatever.

DEL. ROSE (Miss.): I have been insulted by delegates at this congress by the accusation that I was not respectful to the ladies at this convention, and I want to deny that in toto. I did not speak last night because of my respect for the ladies and because of my respect for the Chairman who asked the gentlemen to remain quiet and allow the ladies to carry out the program for themselves. Now I want to say something along the line of chivalry. God bless you, in the South we have—

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade, excuse me, but we are now talking upon the proposition whether we shall accept or reject the amendment as offered. Personalities today will not go in this congress.

DEL. ROSE: I want to talk on the amendment too and discuss it. I have a right to answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have no right to answer any personalities, neither will there be any injected into this congress today.

DEL. ROSE: If you allow one delegate to insult another, I have a right to answer him.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are out of order.

DEL. ROSE: I appeal to the congress from the decision of the Chair. If the Chairman allows personalities he must allow me to answer those personalities.

Delegate Goebel was called to the Chair, and put the question on sustaining the Chair, and the Chair was sustained.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I wish to say a word in regard to the subject matter that is now before you for consideration. I made my declaration for woman suffrage thirty-six years ago when I joined the Socialist Party. Twenty-five years ago, when we presented that proposition to Susan B. Anthony, the leading woman of the suffrage movement—possibly of the world—we presented it not as individuals, but as the declaration of an organization. Susan B. Anthony, the head of the woman suffrage movement of that time, desired the support of the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, any

party that could carry the suffrage vote, or that they believed could. They did not care for the ideal declaration of the Socialist Party on that proposition.

I want to call attention at this time to a danger that exists in the agitation in the Socialist Party and by Socialists for this suffrage movement. I listened more intently to the lady delegate's exposition than I did to the substitute, and tried to get her standpoint from what she said. I may be dull, I may misunderstand, but I think she said that in pursuing this agitation by Socialist officials and Socialist organizers we should go into the other suffrage movements and not press the Socialist ideas or position, but simply aid other movements to capture this or that state for the suffrage movement and submerge the Socialist propaganda.

Now, let me call your attention. I get all the information that is published officially of the British movement and their work. I have known by reputation Mrs. Pankhurst for years and years, as one of the most prominent Socialist women in England in the suffrage movement. It appears that she occupied a similar position in the Socialist movement for the suffrage as our lady delegates occupy here, and now on this floor, and to push the suffrage movement to success the suffrage movement was carried out of the Socialist Party and landed on the platform of the opposition during the campaign, and the Socialist idea was absolutely submerged. Mrs. Pankhurst was here in Chicago a few months ago, and banqueted, mind you, by the women of this city as the representative of the suffragist movement. (Applause.) Not only, mind you, does the suffrage movement bring that kind of submergence of the Socialist proposition, but the same kind of success or desire for success brings it in other directions, and the leader of the parliamentary group in the last campaign declared that he was not pressing the Socialist propaganda in his campaign. He was making the fight for the budget, for the other parties that won, and now there is a split in Great Britain caused by those men who are determined to submerge the Socialist proposition and make their fight on other subordinate things and keep them before the eyes of the working class.

DEL. CORY (Wash.): It has been the rule in this congress for the male members or delegates to carry on the work of the whole congress, and the women have very little voice in this

movement, and I, as a woman, demand that they keep quiet and listen now as we have listened for four days. The question before the house this morning is the report of the Woman's Committee. As a woman I cannot see why we should countenance anything that would appear to be affiliating with some other political association. We have been knocking at the doors of all political parties for years past for recognition and admission to their parties on equal ground. We have asked for the right of franchise. It is our birthright, and we should not be compelled to ask this of our party. I as a woman cannot see why we should ask for this to please us, when the Socialist Party has everything in its platform giving us the right of franchise and equal rights, and we as Socialist women have signed that party pledge, cutting loose from all other political parties, the Republicans and Democrats alike, or any other party, and I do not see why we should go over to the suffragist women and join them. We will receive them with open arms at any time into the Socialist Party, and ask them to come and join and help in this movement which is for the emancipation of woman, giving her the suffrage without going to any other party, and for that reason I am opposed in every sense of the word to anything that would appear like going over to another party. I am a Socialist woman, and I want the report of this committee accepted on those grounds.

DEL. CANNON (Ariz.): I desire to speak in opposition to the amendment now before the house, and also in opposition to the amendment which it is to displace. There seems to be an undercurrent feeling here among some delegates that what is wanted amongst our women comrades is a feeling not of class-consciousness, but of sex-consciousness. I am opposed to any feeling of sex-consciousness because it is not the duty of the Socialists or any part of the Socialists to inoculate our comrades with a feeling of sex-consciousness. We are here as Socialists, not as men and women, not to be inoculated with a sort of sex-consciousness; that is what we want to prevent. There seems to be a tendency throughout almost all of the debates we have had upon this floor to stray away from the class struggle. Comrade Maynard tells us we should use it as a guide-post, not as a hitching-post. I am satisfied to use it as a hitching-post, provided you hitch it to the class struggle until we

do away with the capitalist system. I did not catch all of this amendment that was offered today, but there was one phrase that I did catch, and I think most of us heard it, and that phrase is in effect that we will ally ourselves with all moral and progressive movements for the purpose of getting woman suffrage or the enfranchisement of women.

DEL. MAYNARD: I rise to a point of order. I said nothing of the kind. There is no such phrase in it. I wish to have it read.

The Secretary read Delegate Maynard's amendment.

DEL. CANNON: I wish to retract what I said in regard to moral and progressive. I misunderstood Comrade Maynard when she read it. It says "Ardent and persistent." I understood her to say "Moral and progressive." However, I am still opposed to the amendment, and I favor the original draft that was presented by Comrade Simons last evening. It is short, it is concise, it is to the point. We have a clear cut statement there in very few words, put in such a manner that every one of us can understand what is meant by it, and this amendment and the one which it displaces is a long statement; we have sentences some of which are plain enough and unqualified enough, and then we have other sentences qualifying and disqualifying them, and after we read it over we do not know what it means. There is entirely too much language. We seem to be struggling with a vocabulary that we must get off on every occasion, instead of confining ourselves to concrete statements of fact upon which we can all stand and which we all understand. There is a surplussage of words, and we must do away with it; it can be interpreted by every different individual that comes to talk upon it to mean something entirely different from what the other one saw. Therefore, I want a concrete statement. The one brought in by Comrade Simons is one that everybody can agree to perfectly, and it seems to be gaining favor among our women comrades.

Where is the other policy going to land us? As an illustration, you are all familiar with the Industrial Workers of the World. If you are not, you should be. Now, they started out upon magnificent lines, with a magnificent purpose, but they made themselves a sect. They disconnected themselves from the great working class movement, and they put themselves in opposition to the members of the Federation of Labor, and said,

"You must work with us or you cannot stay with us." The result was to smash and wreck the movement. You women that are agitating for sex-consciousness are doing the same with the women comrades. You are going to cut them off from the Socialist movement, and you are going to put them up on a pedestal with a halo around their heads, and you are going to wreck the movement. We do not want any Anna Morgan to say to us to go out and organize, and then when we get the girls and women organized, have them told that they must not have anything to do with those awful Socialists. We do not care for Mrs. Belmont's sympathy. It is very cheap notoriety at the expense of the poor devils in New York that have been thrown into court and abused in every possible manner. The little girls on the streets giving five cents of their meager earnings to help that shirtwaist makers' strike have done far more for the working class than all the Morgans and Belmonts ever intend to do to help you. The proposition to co-operate with the suffragist societies is not for your benefit, but it is to take you away from the principles for which you are contending in the Socialist movement. (Applause.)

DEL. MARGUERITE PREVEY (Ohio): There are many delegates present this morning that were not present last evening. There has been a substitute offered this morning that maybe many of the delegates did not hear read last night. In order to clear up the minds of those who were not present at the meeting last evening I desire to read what Comrade Simons had to offer in her original report for the Woman's Committee.

(Del. Prevey read the matter referred to.)

DEL. PREVEY: I would like to ask the comrades who are offering the substitutes and amendments, what do they want the Socialist Party to do? It was said on the floor of the hall last evening by some of the delegates who are present at this Congress that they did not care if Mrs. Belmont was connected with the suffragist society that they were asking the Socialist Party to co-operate with. Let me call your attention to one thing. The Socialist Party cannot co-operate with the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. Why? Because we know that the Republican and Democratic parties are financed by the capitalist class, and therefore under the domination of the capitalist class. I do not believe that

I need more than merely mention to Socialist women the fundamental proposition of the Socialist movement, that any movement that is financed by a particular class will be dominated by the material interests of that particular class. (Applause.) That is one of the fundamental propositions of the Socialist philosophy. Then I want to say to you that if the suffragist movement is financed that way, it is very easy to prove that if some one is elected through the efforts of that society and it comes to some question in which Belmont, who furnished the finances for the movement, is interested, the result will be in favor of those for whose material interest and at whose direction the work of the suffragist society is going to be carried on. We would be just as consistent to advocate co-operating in electing some trade union man nominated by the capitalist class on the Republican or Democratic ticket as we are in advocating co-operation with the suffragist society. You know, we can support a trade union man while he may be of our class and a member of the working class as far as his trade unionism is concerned, but we cannot support him if he is on a party ticket that is financed by the class that opposes us. Therefore, we must take the stand that we cannot support anybody that will not support the Socialist Party. That is why I am opposed to any co-operation with the suffragist society. It would be just as consistent to support a labor movement launched by the Civic Federation and call it a labor party; we would be just as consistent to advocate co-operation with that as we are in advocating co-operation with the woman's suffrage movement. Let me call your attention to the fact that before you adjourn this Congress, you may be compelled to pass upon a proposition of that kind, and do not establish a precedent now. Support Comrade Simons' report. You know the work Comrade Simons has done, which is recognized everywhere. She has given a clear statement of this proposition, and I ask you to support Comrade Simons' original proposition and the report of the committee as a whole, and vote down all amendments that are attempted to be tacked on.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): We have a woman's committee, and there is their report. They are Socialists, not women or men. They come here and make recommendations, not as men or women, but as Socialists. I am going to speak as a member of the party and not as a man or woman. I have often spoken with my

wife on these matters, so I am talking for the family, which is very nice and will save trouble when I go home. I have said many times that every time you scratch an opportunist deep enough you find an impossibilist. (Applause.) The longer I live the more I am impressed with the truth of that statement.

I have heard one of my comrades here ridicule the idea of this substitute, while yesterday, in the debate upon the question of immigration, we were told we must follow the Stuttgart resolution. If we are to follow the Stuttgart resolution or the European Socialists in one matter, why not follow it in others? I do not pretend to have the close intimate knowledge of the foreign Socialist movement that my Comrades Hillquit and Morgan and others may have, but if there is any one thing that I do know it is this, that we must take a position on certain matters in furtherance of other matters germane to the interests of the working class. If I know anything of the conditions abroad I know that in certain of those countries the working class have either no franchise or a very limited franchise, and if I know anything of their actions there the Socialist Party co-operates with any party that will give an extension of the franchise to the working class and thereby give more power to the Socialist working class movement. Whether you know it or not, that is the proposition here to-day, and I say to the comrades who talked about the Stuttgart resolution all day yesterday, that if you have got any backbone and meant what you said yesterday you will take on this matter the same position you did yesterday. I am going to be man enough to follow the logic of the situation. What did the comrade tell us about the I. W. W.? He told us that it made itself into a sect; it cut itself adrift from everything else and as the natural consequence it died, and yet in the next breath he practically proposes the same thing for the Socialist movement. Let us carry on the suffrage work entirely inside the party. I do not propose for one to give these people free sway. I propose to follow them up into every place they go and preach this class struggle. The same thing is involved here that is involved in our attitude toward the trade union. Do you believe that we ought to co-operate with the trade union? That is the issue, whether you know it or not. If you believe in it, in that case, then, you believe we can co-operate with the women's organizations of this country as long as

they are committed to no one political party allied with the capitalist class. That is the issue here. If you are opposed to co-operation with the working class movement, whether I. W. W. or the A. F. of L. If you are opposed to that, then you can consistently oppose this substitute. If you are not opposed to that you cannot consistently oppose this substitute. That is the issue.

MAY WOOD-SIMONS: I rise to a point of information for the delegate. He apparently has never read the statement of the international congress at Stuttgart on this point. Will you allow me to read it to him? It is just a sentence?

DEL. GOEBEL: I will yield to Comrade Simons.

MAY WOOD-SIMONS: This is the resolution accepted by the Stuttgart Congress, as formulated by the women delegates and submitted to that congress: "The Socialist women shall not carry on this struggle for equality of right to vote in alliance with middle class women suffragists, but, in common with the Socialist Party, shall insist upon woman suffrage as one of the fundamental and most important reforms for the full democratization of the political franchise in general."

DEL. GOEBEL: That is good.

DEL. MORGAN: I should say so.

DEL. GOEBEL: Will the secretary kindly make a note that I said something that my friend Morgan approved of?

DEL. MORGAN: It took a long time to get to it though.

DEL. GOEBEL: It is good for the thing that it applies to. I have yet to be shown that the Woman Suffrage Association is a middle class organization. There was a day in this country when to stand up as a woman suffragist was to be ostracized. I know that that movement has developed along the line of persecution to some extent, and the fact that Mrs. Belmont or Miss Morgan or some one of that sort is coming into that organization trying to capture it or to gain notoriety is not going to make me lose sight of the essential fact. It is made up of all women for just one purpose, to get the franchise for women. Do we believe in universal franchise? I am not so much interested in the resolutions of the European Socialists as I am in their acts. Now, am I right or wrong in saying that every European Socialist organization unites with any other organization at times of crisis in seeking to bring about a further extension of the franchise

to the working class? If they do that in the case of the men, why shall they not do it in the case of the women? If we believe in woman suffrage, if we believe it is such an essential thing to the women of this country, let us send out a recommendation from this congress that will not be read either way, that will allow this comrade down in New York to say: "We have nothing to do with you; we won't work with you—"

COM. MALKIEL: That is not true.

DEL. GOEBEL: Let us say that we are going to do with the woman organizations of this country precisely what we do with the trade unions. Do I love Gompers? Hardly. Do I love Mitchell? Hardly. Shall I stay out of the ranks or organized labor because there is a Gompers or a Mitchell at the head of it? We did that in the town of Newark. We fought the trade unions; and they fought us. We said Gompers had them by the throat. But we changed our tactics and instead of saying Gompers was no good we went to the trade unions and said, here are some things that we believe in that you believe in. You may not accept all our views on Socialism, but you believe in free press and free speech. A few years ago, in Newark, there was hardly a Socialist in the trades council and now practically every member is a Socialist with a Socialist as chairman of our meetings. And I hardly think the class struggle has been lost sight of. In fact, the old party politicians are running around and skirmishing as they have not done for forty years. That shows me that we have hit somebody. And what we have found true of the trade unions we will find true of the woman's suffrage organizations. Do you know anything about this woman's political movement? I do. In my town my wife used to be an officer of it, and my wife and I are just close enough to each other so that we occasionally talk over things that we are mutually interested in. Now, in my town it is not a middle class organization. It is made up of the girls that live "On the Hill" as we call it, that work in the sweat shops along with school teachers and that class of women, and if you choose to say that that class of women shall not be co-operated with, all right, but for me I am going to march along with any man or woman who is going my way as long as they do not forget the thing I am after, or interfere with it, the wiping out of the class struggle.

COM. MALKIEL: I want to say a word to Comrade Goebel. When my

comrades come to me and say, "Why do you go to the trade unions, why do you ally yourself with the woman suffragists?"

I excuse them because they still have very much to learn. They have still very little experience in the work of the Socialist movement; but when a member of the National Executive Committee gets up on the floor of this congress and compares the trade union movement with the suffrage movement, I am very sorry for his lack of knowledge of that movement or of Socialism. Comrades, we are the Socialist Party. We are the mouthpiece of the working class and therefore it is our duty to go among the working class, no matter whether they are foolish enough to have Mitchell or Gompers at their head. It is our business to teach them to get away from Mitchell and Gompers. But when we co-operate, the Socialist movement with the suffrage movement, what do we do? Why, we extend our hand to the other class and say, "You are all good. It makes no difference whether you live on those who create all wealth, you happen to be born a woman and therefore we can work and suffer and starve to help you out. We will all get the vote and then we will send you to Congress." Now, our recommendation offers every Socialist woman a chance to work for suffrage. It is clear. I don't wish to repeat it, but I will repeat two lines of it. "Woman's disfranchisement being a great factor in aggravating her economic dependence, we urge the party to take more direct action in the matter of woman suffrage, which should, however, be carried on under party supervision and advocated from party platforms." Now we urge you to do everything in your power for suffrage, because as long as we have one-half of the human race enslaved, as long as one-half of the race are powerless to express their views, this world can never be free. We want to do everything in our power in this direction but we want to do it as class conscious Socialists. We want to do everything we can for the working class. What does this substitute say? It does not urge you to do any more work for suffrage. It tells us we are going to express our pleasure to the others for their work. But what of it? Where does the consistency come in? We are going to extend our hand to them. We have no objections to their working, but let them work in their line all they want. But let us work in our line. Of course, if the Socialist Party joins with the suffrage movement it will

strengthen it. They are going to get the vote more easily. But is it everything for the Socialist to get the vote? Is that the ultimate goal of the Socialist? If you go out and join with the suffragists and then demand their vote, you will go to the farmer's wife. I was accused yesterday of talking altogether about New York. I am not so narrow minded as that. I am talking about the working class of the United States. In that class I include the school teacher; I include the librarian; I include every wage earning woman; but I also include every woman working in the home; the farmer's wife; the wage earner's wife; every woman who belongs to the working class. Now you will go before those women and you say we want the vote for all women, and you will tell them that these other people, those that want limited suffrage in England, you will tell them they are the finest people in the world. The working women will say here, they are very good to us. They give us the vote. They will believe they are good people. You in the west are confronted with a different situation from us in the east. You have a better situation than we in the east. It won't take very long before you will get your vote. What will be the result? You yourselves have taught your women that these fine ladies are the very finest people. Can you blame them if they vote for those finest people? But suppose you go to the women as Socialists all the time and you say to them: "You women ought to have the vote the same as your sons' and your husbands and fathers; we shall do all we can to help you to get it, but remember when you have got the vote you have to use it and it is your duty to work hand in hand with the whole working class for the final bringing about of the Socialist co-operative commonwealth."

Now, Morris Hillquit said last night that I apparently came all the way from New York to agitate among you comrades. Perhaps there is some truth in it. I don't think it hurt some of you comrades. He says I should go out and talk to the masses. I have talked to the masses. If Comrade Hillquit and I were to compare on the talking to the masses that we have done I do not think that I should be the loser. But it is just because I want to go among the masses, and because the masses are dearer to me than the classes that I urge to accept this resolution which in a few direct words tells you what you ought to do. This resolution does not mean that you are

to confine yourselves within any narrow sphere. On the contrary we want you to go out to the world; go everywhere; into the palace and the hamlet; but it won't do you much good to go into the palace and preach Socialism—but you want to go everywhere as a Socialist.

Our friend Hillquit says it is a good thing to go there and work with them in this suffrage movement. Does Comrade Hillquit remember that when we went and worked with those people and we had a demonstration for the striking shirt-waist makers, originated by the Socialists, and because we wanted to have the world with us, we invited the other organizations to work with us in that demonstration, and when we came there and had our list of speakers, and we had Comrade Morris Hillquit as one of the speakers, that he had the hardest fight because they said they wanted a respectable meeting; they did not want any Socialist agitators? And the comrade knows the fight I had on the floor fighting for his cause and for the Socialist cause.

DEL. COHEN (Pa.): I hope that, whatever conclusion we come to on this, that I shall recognize all my comrades as just as class-conscious as I am.

As regards the Stuttgart resolution, I am heartily in accord with that resolution, which says we ought not to co-operate with any middle class movement; as I understand it, however, a middle class proposition is one that is for the middle class, limited suffrage, property qualifications, and so forth. Any proposition that demands equal universal suffrage for all classes is not a middle class movement.

I should like to get right down to the real difference between the report of the committee and the substitute offered. I consider the report of the committee is a position in advance of what the party would have taken two years ago, and in advance of the position that many of our members would take for many years to come. Many of our comrades believe that woman suffrage is none of our business at all. They also believe that trade union business is none of our business at all. They, as a general proposition, will be found voting for the report and against the substitute. Some of our comrades even objected to the Woman's National Committee being created. And consequently, when that woman's committee comes in and asks to have a meeting every month, that is far in advance of the old position. It is also advanced in asking us to have in every city strike

committees to co-operate with such of the working class as happen to be engaged in the economic struggle in that way. I want to say that is an advanced position, because when the strike of the shirtwaist makers occurred in Philadelphia, some of us wanted the Socialist Party to establish a committee to co-operate with them. We were asked to vote it down. Now, that is an advanced position, and I am glad to see it. I believe that, speaking broadly, what we are entitled to do as individual Socialists we are entitled to do as a body. I believe that this woman suffrage question is a working class question; I want to get the suffrage even though it may seem to some of my comrades who are just as class conscious as I am, that we are violating some of our principles in doing so. I think we ought to go as a party into the legislative halls, in the agitation everywhere, to support every measure that looks toward working class supremacy up to the point of compromising our principles, but there we must stop. Some of the comrades who think this suffrage question is a middle class question, don't they know that our comrades all over the world, when they go into the legislative halls, do not ask: "Is this a conservative measure, is this a liberal measure?" The only thing they ask is: "Is this a working class proposition?" if it is, irrespective of where it comes from, we favor it. If it is not a working class proposition, irrespective of the fact that it may even come from a member of our own party, we are opposed to it.

This is a question of tactics. And I am going to ask you to vote for both the report of the committee and for this amendment, because I believe as a matter of tactics we should go just as far as we consistently can and not do just as little as we can in this way; go just as far as we consistently can for every advanced movement because it is a working class movement and a benefit to our class, always stopping short of compromising our principles.

DEL. FACKERT (N. J.): I am anxious to see this congress hew to the line and not get into too many entangling alliances. We are liable to get mixed up if we do. I hope the comrades will bear in mind that there is nothing in the obligations that we take when we enter the Socialist movement that will prevent us as individuals from working in any of these movements. As the suffrage movement is not now affiliated with any of the old parties, and is not controlled by them,

there is nothing to prevent any of our comrades from acting as individuals in the Socialist movement. But I do think it would be wrong for us as an organization to place ourselves in a position where it might appear that we are seeking help from some other organization. This party should lead on every vital question such as this is. There is no question where we as a party stand on this. There is simply a question of how we shall act. I am not in favor of any amendment or any substitutes. I believe we should adopt the report of the committee as it stands.

DEL. CAREY (Mass.): I rise merely for the purpose of making a statement of fact and then asking for some information. Last year the Woman Suffrage Association presented a law for woman suffrage in the state of Massachusetts, providing for absolute universal suffrage, without any property qualifications. The Woman Suffrage Association decided to approach the subject by dividing the women into various groups. Among those groups was a Socialist woman's group, the intention being that each group through its chairman should present its position from its own standpoint before the Legislative Committee. The members of the party in and around Boston formed the Socialist group, and in common with other women who were not Socialists, perhaps, at least some of them were not, and they went to the State House and the chairman of the Socialist group was Comrade Wentworth, who is present now as a delegate from Massachusetts, and had in their ranks Comrade D'Orsay, who is also a delegate here. I find the two delegates from Massachusetts divided here, and it is for the purpose of asking one question that I rise now. Does the report or the substitute prevent or advise the co-operation of the Socialist women of Massachusetts in such a movement as that? Does it prevent them from forming a division in the ranks of the Woman Suffragists when they appear before the legislative committee and present their case? Does the report prevent us from doing what we did in that case? If it does, I am against such a thing. The Socialist group there formed one of the ten groups that marched to the state house, and laid their case before the committee from their various standpoints, and these Socialist women were the largest group and came into the state house carrying the red flag. Now, that ought, of course, to be the text for some oratory—

DEL. MALKIEL: Did the Socialist women speak there?

DEL. CAREY: They did not.

DEL. MALKIEL: Why did they not speak?

DEL. CAREY: For the reason that the time allotted had been exceeded by the previous speakers. But comrade Wentworth was permitted afterwards to make a very lengthy and very eloquent speech to the entire body of women. There was one other group that was excluded because of the expiration of the time. I believe the Socialist women of Massachusetts did an excellent turn for the Socialist movement by marching to the state house in company with the others as they did, though they were part of a demonstration that contained many women who were not Socialists. It was their place to be there and I am against any proposition that would prevent the Socialist women of Massachusetts doing the same thing if the occasion should again arise.

DEL. MALKIEL: A point of order. There is nothing in the report that would prevent that.

DEL. CAREY: That is not a point of order; that is not even half a point. The situation is this: I am not clear as to the meaning of this proposition. I find two women delegates from my state divided although they agree in their principles as to co-operation in this sort of movement. Will somebody kindly inform me? Does this original report oppose the women of Massachusetts doing again what they did in the case I have stated, if they think it best to do so?

Cries of "No. No."

DEL. CAREY: Does the substitute oppose it?

DEL. MERRICK: The chairman of the committee should be given a chance to answer.

DEL. CAREY: I ask the question through the chair. We save time when we proceed along parliamentary lines. I want that information and I think I have a right to it. Who can furnish it to me? I want harmony in my delegation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will the comrade from Illinois furnish the information?

MAY WOOD-SIMONS: There is nothing in the report of the Woman's Committee as it now stands that would prevent any such action on the part of a group of Socialist women as the comrade describes as taking place in Massachusetts. Nothing whatever.

DEL. MAYNARD: I was sorry to see this trouble on the floor of the congress, and I was sorry that I offered this sub-

stitute, but since this discussion has taken place I believe the introduction of the substitute was desirable because while the report may not prevent such action as has just been referred to, it does leave the way open for any comrade in any local to protest whenever there is anything of any kind offered that is in any degree in conformity with anybody else. And therefore, while we should not go out of our way to encourage this sort of thing I think it should be clearly allowed.

COM. DICKINSON (Fla.) (Alt.): There is a sex problem that we cannot get rid of, and yet at the same time that we must get rid of, and this is the only national organization in the world that is brave enough to wipe out all the history that we have made on this point for twenty centuries, all man made, and that still tells us that we women are made out of one of your ribs. We have got to make a new woman out of the other rib in order to stand even.

Now, for the life of me I can't see the difference in these propositions; others can. In Arizona, Massachusetts, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, Rhode Island, South Dakota and Wisconsin, they all went up against the suffrage movement last year and defeated it. Now, if in any way the Socialist Party can associate as a party with these movements that are working for the ballot for all women without interfering with our demand for the removal of the wage system, and for the removal of the environment that creates the wage problem, we ought to do it. But this original report, as I conceive it, does not in any way interfere with that. If from your point of view, however, it does interfere, all right. Biologically, what have we to use for judgment? We have simply what has come into our eyes and ears and noses, through all our senses, and been stored up in our brain. We all come from different environments from childhood up; and that is one reason we differ. You give fourteen similar facts to fourteen different people, and you will likely have fourteen different conclusions. Each must decide for himself. Personally I think the original report covers it all; and we need no amendment whatever.

DEL. WILSON (Calif.): Now, comrades, the Socialist Party is at the point in this country when it will have to decide whether it shall be a sect or a political party. The moment the Socialist Party takes a position, whether it shall be a sect speaking beautiful phrases, or a political party taking fundamental principles and

applying them in terms of statesmanship to practical problems, at that moment we are confronted with practical questions such as confronted us yesterday, and such as confront us to-day. The question here is not the relation of the Socialist Party to women. The question is the attitude of the party as a whole to woman suffrage, to universal suffrage for women. That movement is old and is established; we were not the pioneers in that movement. We are here in our place to champion the class struggle. We know that we cannot deliver woman until we have delivered the working class. That is settled and taken for granted here. That is not disputed here. The question is, what shall be our attitude to this question that is hanging right over our heads? I am a member of a Socialist Local; that local is in Berkeley, California. I belong to the state movement in California that is fighting for universal suffrage for women, an activity that has been in that state for thirty or forty years, and is now reaching a very acute stage. I have asked the chairman of this committee if, under the original report, I can work for woman suffrage with this suffrage association. She says I may as an individual. Then I asked: May my local do so? Now I would like to have this matter cleared up. We want to work freely in our state organization and in our locals. We want to work constitutionally. We don't want to be bound. But if we are bound we want to know that we are bound. I am ready to submit to the party discipline, whatever it may be. The original report says: "Action should be carried on under party supervision, and advocated from party platforms." Does this mean that in our agitation as individuals, as locals and as a state organization we shall carry on our agitation only under party supervision and from the party platforms? I hope the chairman will answer that question when she sums up.

Comrade Carey says ten groups of women went to the state legislature of Massachusetts, and a Socialist group went with them. One group of women is going to the state legislature of California; shall our Socialist women go with them? Shall they stay at home? If they go with them, shall they speak with them? Shall they be permitted to stand on the same platform with them? Shall I speak for them on the same platform where somebody else speaks who is not a Socialist? The women of San Francisco have canvassed that whole city from door

to door, and they have gathered a vast list of names of women; that was done under the administration of one group of women. Our Socialist women co-operated with the other women of San Francisco to do that. Was that right? Shall the Socialist women of California refuse to do that? Or shall they get up a separate list and let the others get up a separate list?

Now, when we go back to our locals we can't go with a phrase; it is ridiculous. Socialism means the social ownership of the means of production and distribution and of exchange; and it means its democratic management. That is what you have got; and that is all you have got. The rank and file of the Socialist Party are ready to move; they want to do something; they are ready to move and the rank and file of the Socialist Party are going to move. We are ready to move and you won't let us move. I am willing to have my mouth sewed up. I am willing to submit to the party discipline; I will try to be a good soldier in the Socialist army; you can silence me; you can hold me; you can chain me; you can fill my mouth with beautiful phrases and say: Repeat them. But our comrades of the rank and file are chafing at the inaction; they are looking for a lead. The movement all over the country is calling for action. Will you lead or will you pursue? We want the class struggle, Comrade Malkiel; we will never cease to fight for it. We want to fight for the working class women; and we will never desert them. But simply because a few women whom I will not mention—they have received undue notoriety here this morning—have gone into the movement, and have been written up by the capitalistic newspapers—is that any reason why we should be indifferent to the struggle of the great mass of the women of America for universal suffrage? I say, no. A thousand times no. There are tens of thousands of women in the United States who have never heard of the Socialist movement. But they are for woman suffrage. And they will be with us yet. They belong to us. It is for us to give them a lead. As that report stands, now, if it does not mean the same as the substitute I am opposed to it. I don't want to work in this movement as an individual. I want to work as a Socialist. I want to go as a member of the Socialist Party. I want to go as a member of the state organization of California. I want to go if there is a national congress of that movement and speak; and if you silence

me and if you tie me, I will submit. I and my comrades will sweat under the collar; we are waiting for powerful, legitimate, consistent, statesmanlike action and leadership; not simply the mouthing of phrases. I ask you to vote for this substitute if it does not conflict with the fundamental principles of the class struggle, and I believe it does not.

DEL. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): This is a matter of the tactics of one organization, a national organization, in dealing with another national organization. Now the American Woman's Suffrage Association is an organization working for the ballot for women. I say that organization is not a middle class organization. I know that organization is composed of women of all classes. I know that they are simply united on this one issue: the ballot for the women of America. The Socialist Party has pledged itself to work for the emancipation of women. Now, the sane thing for this organization to do is to take action on this matter that is consistent with its action on other immediate demands. When the question of free speech came up, we stated that the Socialist Party was in hearty sympathy with the I. W. W. in that fight because they were fighting for one of the fundamentals of the Socialist belief, free speech. The Socialist Party said: "We don't care whether you want political action or not; we are with you in this fight. We are with you in the thing which you want, which is for the interest of the working class." We co-operated with the organization. When the question of the Russian and Mexican refugees came up, the leaders in our organization became officials in the relief organization. That organization was non-political; composed of men and women of all parties, of all races, of all creeds. We took that stand, because the thing they were fighting for was for the interest of the working class. We co-operated with that organization. I hope that when you vote upon this question, which is of great importance to our movement at this time, that you will decide intelligently. I hope you will not be influenced by mere oratory. Strip the points of all sentiment and oratory and decide them intelligently. It is a matter of obliterating class lines for the purpose of working for the thing that the working class wants now. Bear these things in mind and vote for Mrs. Maynard's substitute.

DEL. ESTHER LAUKKI (Minn.): If delegates are going to stand before a Socialist congress and say that we are in

this fight for a sex and not for a class I think that is something we ought not to stand for. I tell you whether Mrs. Belmont or Hetty Green get the ballot or not they will get what they want through the capitalist men.

Now, is this woman suffrage association a political movement, or is it a class movement, or what is it? I have studied the proceedings of their last convention and they show that they are opposed to Socialism. You will find it announced that the suffrage movement has made a great gain in the last year; it has gained the vote for women who pay taxes in Michigan to vote on tax questions. They proclaim that they are for universal suffrage, but they are willing to take a limited suffrage. If they are willing to accept that, we Socialists have nothing to do with them. If we really think this is for the benefit of the workers, all right; let us fight for it. But so far as I have studied the thing I cannot see any benefit in it. Some of the comrades have said here that in Europe the Socialist organizations have fought with the capitalists when it was something in favor of the working class. What has been the attitude of the English Socialists toward their suffrage association? They said they did not want to have anything to do with them. And in Finland we tried to smooth it down. But we found that in the end the capitalist women had nothing for us. We women and men of the Socialist movement want to get the women to understand that it is a class and not a sex problem. Don't let the capitalist women come and agitate with our help among our women. Now, if we are going to tell our women that they can join this suffrage association, it is all right. But, if you accept this substitute, it will put the responsibility on every local in every state to urge their women to join the suffrage association. That is plainly in the amendment as I see it. Read this original report: "Resolved, That the Socialist Party demands equal suffrage, regardless of sex, color or race, and pledges itself to work, advocate and agitate for it." What else do you want? That places us where, if it is brought up in the legislature, we Socialists have the right to stand there as representatives of the Socialist Party and ask for it. If they think it is better to mix up their speeches with ours, that is all right. But if they see there is no benefit, they will not.

Now, I believe in the materialistic conception. A woman is an animal as well

as a man. If you say that woman is more social than man let us go back to the savage. Is she social when she protects her infant from another woman? Is she social when she is protecting her tribe? If another tribe comes against hers, she will kill. Is there any more social instinct in a woman than in a man? It is the class behind it and not the social instinct.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair wishes to announce that Comrade Berger has announced that when he gets the floor he will move the previous question.

Delegate Strebel made the point of order that inasmuch as the chairman had taken a list of names and had been recognizing speakers from that list it would not be fair to cut off the debate, and that, if any list was kept, an opportunity should be given all delegates to place their names on the list.

The chairman ruled the point not well taken, as he was taking no formal list, but simply keeping himself informed for his own purposes of those who rose and tried to get the floor.

A DELEGATE: Will the previous question shut off debate?

DEL. BERGER: Yes. We have debated this question all last night and all this morning and we have about fifty other subjects to take up. The reporters for the majority report and the mover of the substitute will have their speeches anyway.

DEL. LENA MORROW LEWIS: When it comes to a Socialist convention, with rare exceptions the sex or class lines are obliterated. We work in the Socialist party not as men working against women, nor as women working against men; but as human beings. When we go into the world outside and take part in political and social activities, we are confronted with the fact that women with the exception of four states in the west are disfranchised, and we cannot blind ourselves to the fact that as a sex, the women of New York, of Massachusetts and of Illinois have no vote. Therefore, as women seeking enfranchisement they stand together as women on this one point.

It has been charged here to-day that this suffrage association is a political organization. The woman's suffrage association is not a political party. Political parties have definite programmes, and stand for specific political ends and are always affected by class interests. The woman's suffrage association does not put a political party in the field standing for class interests. And when the argument

is presented, that because, when the Belmonts and the Harrimans and the Hills put up money for the Democratic and Republican parties, they are helping to perpetuate those parties that stand for the present system, therefore the same argument applies to the women who have helped to finance the suffrage movement, that argument is not well founded, because they are helping to place in the hands of the working women of the country the weapon with which they will end the present system. The Woman's Suffrage Association stands for the unlimited, unqualified ballot for women. Any man, therefore, who helps that association, is helping to put an end to the present social system. But if ever the time comes when that association shall stand for a limited suffrage then we cannot unite with them; we cannot co-operate with them. When it came in Illinois to the point where the association had a chance to come out and perhaps get a limited suffrage the state president for Illinois said: "No; we stand for the unlimited suffrage and not for any half loaf; or even a slice. We want all that we stand for, and shall fight until we get it."

In Oklahoma the Democratic party said to the suffrage association: "You can have this measure go through provided you will stand with us on the grandfather clause. Now, the grandfather clause I will explain for the benefit of those of you who never heard of it. The idea is this: That a man or woman cannot vote in Oklahoma unless their grandfather was a voter. That virtually disfranchises the entire colored race. The suffrage association, through its national representative who had been sent to Oklahoma, said to the women there: "I don't know where you stand, but if you stand for this grandfather clause I quit the state of Oklahoma; the National Association will withdraw its support and we shall have nothing to do with you. And the women of the Woman's Suffrage Association of Oklahoma every last one of them stood against that grandfather clause."

So long as this movement is non-partisan; so long as it stands for unlimited, unqualified suffrage, we ought to co-operate with it. And just in proportion as we get the ballot for the working women will they begin to take a greater and greater interest and part in the fight for the triumph of the working class.

So, comrades, we have everything to gain by co-operation so long as that co-

operation does not conflict with our fundamental principles, and so long as we can win the weapon by which we are going to be able to abolish for ever this system.

Delegate Berger here moved the previous question.

The point of order was made that the previous question would shut off the reporters and chairman of the committee. The chairman ruled that it would, but was overruled on appeal.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chairman of the committee has the floor to close the debate.

DEL. MAY WOOD-SIMONS: First of all I want to take up the report of this woman's committee and tell you what it really does mean. You have heard it twice and I will not read it to you again. If I am to interpret this report, it means this, and it was so understood by the committee: If you are in the midst of a fight, as Comrade Stitt Wilson says, for the suffrage in California, it does not bar you Socialists from taking part in any public meeting; or prevent you from sending a representation to take part in a legislative demonstration. Nothing of the sort. Comrade Carey asks, would it not shut off such activities as they have had in Massachusetts? Not at all. It simply means that we do wish the Socialist movement to carry on the agitation for the suffrage—not as Comrade Hillquit's resolution would do, shift it more over to the suffrage association and leave the Socialist Party rather apart from it; not at all. We want the Socialist movement engaged in this; but when conditions are as they are in perhaps three-quarters of the states to-day, where no particular bill is before the legislature, when no crisis has been reached, then we want our Socialist women to be working to build up the Socialist Party; and at the same time in building up the Socialist Party, making just so many Socialists. Every time you make a Socialist you make a suffragist.

I am not one who necessarily bows down to the Stuttgart resolutions, but Comrade Hillquit, who presents this report on woman's activities, was one of the delegates who voted for it at the Stuttgart conference. Now, I have read to you this morning what the resolution stands for—the Stuttgart resolution. Comrade Cohen has made the point that the Stuttgart resolution says that we shall not work with other suffrage associations. I take it that the resolution means continuous day to day work; and the resolution

does not make any mention of limited suffrage. If it had done so we should have been in an entirely different position. Now, this report does not shut you off from speaking as individuals on any suffrage platform. I must disagree with Comrade Hillquit, when he says that what we may do as individuals we may do as a party. It is not quite true. Some of us might wish to belong to the Anti-Vaccination League or the Anti-Vivisection League, but we would not ask the party to commit itself on those propositions.

We have in this country a situation very similar to that in Europe. We must work for suffrage in different states. We leave that matter entirely out of our report. It was discussed at great length by the committee, but we believed that the brief statement that we have made covered all the points; and with the interpretation that I have given, I believe it does. Now, in Oregon, I am told that there is a bill pending for limited suffrage on a property qualification for women. We could not co-operate there. We have had exactly the same situation in Illinois. So, when Comrade Hillquit says that the National Association stands for universal suffrage that may be true, but in the states there is a certain autonomy in the suffrage movement, and in one state women may decide to work for a limited suffrage; and under those conditions we cannot co-operate with them. Here, in Illinois, we have been repeatedly asked to go out and support individual Democrats or Republicans who would pledge themselves to work for suffrage in Congress. We cannot do that. When are we to be with and when are we to be against this chameleon like suffrage movement? The Socialist must decide, the Socialist Party must decide in the different localities. Therefore we have left that question entirely out of this report, trusting that the Socialists in their respective localities would be clear enough when it came to any question of action.

I want to point out this, however. It is said that the National Suffrage Association never stands for anything but unlimited suffrage. I hold in my hand the report of the forty-first convention, and in this report under this introduction it says: "During the year 1908 our cause won four solid victories;" mark the words—"four solid victories; Michigan gave the tax paying women a vote on questions of local taxation; Denmark gave the women who are taxpayers or the wives of tax payers a vote for the

office of member of Parliament." I took that matter before the National Convention of the Woman's Suffrage Association when it met in Chicago; I took that before the resolutions committee personally and asked them to condemn the action taken by the Supreme Court on the Moyer-Haywood-Pettibone case, and they were passing resolutions on various subjects; but they refused to entertain the resolution, refused even to allow it to go on the floor, and no Socialist woman served on any committee, or spoke before that convention.

We cannot speak of the class struggle from the platform of the suffrage association. You cannot wipe away the class struggle among women and say it is just a beautiful sisterhood. There is a struggle there as much as there is among the men. While I will work for the ballot, I have behind me a political party that has pledged itself, and I don't propose as Comrade Hillquit would do, to shift it off the shoulders of the Socialist Party and on to the shoulders of the Suffrage Association. I have back of me a political party that is willing to fight with me in this struggle. Our Comrade Hillquit asked us last night where should we go to get our material? Why are we working for suffrage in our own little group, when we are all suffragists already? But I want to say that if we want the working women, and I take it we do, if we wish them to come to a realization of their real class interests, we shall not do it by talking Socialism to them alone. It is just about as easy to make a Socialist as it is a suffragist. In the state of Colorado the women have the ballot and there they are making just as big a struggle to get the women to understand Socialism, so that they can use their ballot intelligently, as is being made elsewhere to get the ballot for the women.

One more thing. We have already done all of the things that Comrade Stitt Wilson asked if he might be permitted to do. We, as a committee, collected over four thousand petitions and sent them down to Washington—suffrage petitions. We did this as members of the Socialist Party. We stamped at the head of each one: "Collected by the members of the Socialist Party." And that showing of names collected by the Socialist women of the country was one of the most remarkable things at that conference. Comrade Spargo, speaking of Comrade Work's report, said we did not intend to become the tail of some anti-vaccination or some other anti league. Neither do

we wish to become the tail of the Suffrage association. I ask the Socialist women and I ask the Socialist men to fight to attain political equality, but don't do it as the tail of some organization, don't always drag along at the end of something else. But let us lead in this matter.

Shall we dissipate our energies building up an outside organization? You say that in Europe the party co-operates with any party when the crisis comes. Well and good. But they don't spend their energies in building up those organizations first. They co-operate with them in the crises; we do the same. The working woman has only a certain amount of energy to expend; if she spends it in the suffrage movement, she will not spend it in the Socialist movement. While I want the ballot, I don't consider that the great thing; I am fighting for that as a means to a greater thing. If we spend all our time in building up a suffrage movement, then when we have

obtained the ballot we shall have to begin all over again to educate the woman to use that ballot intelligently.

I ask you to vote for the report as it stands. It does not tie your hands in any way whatever. It leaves you the opportunity to work in your own individual localities as the situation may seem to demand. But it does not allow the impression to go out that we, as Socialists, recommend that we should go along in this work in co-operation with the suffrage associations. I know of one woman in our Chicago local, who has brought in thirteen new Socialists in the past six weeks, and that means thirteen new suffragists, if you please.

I ask you to vote for the report as it stands.

Upon a division the amendment of Delegate Maynard was defeated.

The report was then adopted as read.
Adjourned until 2:30 P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Chairman Willert called the Congress to order at two o'clock P. M., and announced that the next order of business would be the report of the special committee elected on the Organization report.

Delegate Work made the point that the report of the Woman's Committee had not yet been completely acted upon.

The Chairman held that the entire report of the committee had been before the Congress, and that the next business in order would be the election of a Woman's Committee of seven members.

ELECTION OF WOMAN'S COMMITTEE.

The following nominations were made as members of the Woman's Committee: J. Stitt Wilson (Calif.), Mila Tupper Maynard (Colo.), May Wood-Simons (Ill.), Winnie E. Branstetter (Okla.), Caroline A. Lowe (Kans.), Lena Morrow Lewis (Cal.), Theresa Malkiel (N. Y.), Maud Thompson (Mich.), Ella Reeve Bloor (Conn.), Elizabeth H. Thomas (Wis.), Esther Laukki (Minn.), Marguerite Prevey (Ohio), Anna Maley (Minn.), Mary E. Garbut (Calif.) The name of J. Stitt Wilson was withdrawn, also the names of Anna Maley, and Ella Reeve Bloor.

Thereupon the regular order of business was resumed after the tellers had collected the ballots and retired to count them.

The Chairman called for the report of the special committee on Organization. Delegate Berger announced that the committee was not yet ready to report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next thing in order would be the report of the committee on the Agricultural problem.

DEL. M'DERMOTT (Mont.): I move that the Committee on Immigration be continued until the next National Convention or Congress, and that it study along the same line laid down by the previous convention, and that it include in its report what bearing unrestricted immigration would be apt to have on the international Socialist movement of the world.

(No second.)

AGRICULTURAL PROBLEM.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next thing in order would be the report of the committee on Agricultural problems.

Delegate A. M. Simons, on behalf of the committee, presented the report on the agricultural question. During the reading of the report Delegate Simons made the following remarks:

DEL. SIMONS: The committee has placed in there the farmers' program of Oklahoma, because that is, as far as I know, the first farmers' program worked out in any state organization, and I feel very certain that the other members of the committee agree with me that the

delegates ought to have that before them, as it is worked out by a larger body, and I believe an equally capable body at least with the members of the committee, on the farmers' question. We do not endorse that in all places, nor do we condemn it everywhere. I have not read over Comrade Lee's recommendations at the close. Those were received separately. We did not work together by mail very successfully. It was rather slow work. Now I will read our suggestions for the farmers' program. I just want to preface that by saying that the statements that

have been made here are largely to show the underlying facts that are necessary to a grasp of the farmers' program. There are great changes taking place in some lines of agriculture, but so far as I am concerned, and so far as a majority of the members of the committee are concerned, we frankly admitted that we did not know what position we were going to take or how we were going to handle it.

Whereupon the reading of the report of the committee was completed. The report is as follows:

REPORT OF FARMERS' COMMITTEE

Although the first draft of this report was submitted to the full committee and the present draft was rewritten largely to meet suggestions made by various members, yet, because there has not been sufficient time to permit a second revision by the entire committee, no one save myself can be held strictly responsible for the matter it contains.

Comrade Algernon Lee also submitted a suggestion towards a report, and since there is no opportunity for revision or discussion his matter is also submitted above his name.

Fraternally,

(Signed) A. M. SIMONS,
Chairman Farmers' Committee.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FARMERS' COMMITTEE.

Unfortunately this report must necessarily be issued before the census of 1910 is completed. Its conclusions must therefore be based largely on observations of general tendencies and not upon statistical data.

The most striking thing about agriculture at the present moment is that it is just entering a new stage. The changes during the past few years have been greater than in many previous centuries. This change is seen not alone in improved farm machinery, although this has played its part. The old extensive system of single crop farming has almost disappeared. This change carries with it the theory based upon the idea that specialized cultivation of large areas would increase until the large farms would swallow up the smaller ones. It is time for Socialists to completely abandon this theory. Fifty years of the most rapid agricultural evolution has produced no sign of any tendency in the direction of such a form of concentration. Farms at the present time are probably smaller per unit of area than ever before. This does not mean that concentration has passed farming by, but only that it has taken on a different form from what Socialists of fifty years ago expected.

The basic feature of the new farming is found in the fact that the farm is becoming an agricultural factory. In all lines of industry the great obstacles to concentration have been found in the uncertainties of the trade and the impossibility of continuous operation. So long as farming was dependent upon the caprices of soil, weather, insects and individual skill, it could never be sufficiently standardized to enable it to follow the course of factory industry.

Progress in all lines of industry consists largely in substituting certainty for chance. This process is now going on very rapidly in agriculture. The new farming is very little dependent upon heat or cold or water of nature. All these can now be supplied artificially, and the introduction of certain and complete control renders the new methods more economical than the free supply of nature.

The soil, once largely the most important element, has ceased to be of any great importance. Soil can now be manufactured, almost to order, and the land furnishes little more than a location. It is now a part of the capital of the farmer, and not always even of the fixed capital.

This control of the soil depends largely upon the use of artificial fertilizers, and

here again we seem to be entering upon a new era. While upon most farms the great mass of fertilizing material is still produced on the farm itself, and the use of certain crops for fertilizing purposes is being highly developed, yet the great source of supply is becoming controlled by phosphate and nitrate trusts, and the most important element, nitrogen, is now being produced mechanically by electric plants. Another important source is the Beef Trust, through their utilization of by products.

The whole irrigation movement is but a part of this change. Wherever water is supplied artificially, the price of the land is so high that it is profitable to practically re-make the soil, if it is not satisfactory.

On the mechanical side, recent changes have tended to develop this same tendency. The production of artificial heat requires a large capital. New standards of purity in dairy products are requiring greater expense and more factory-like organization of the industry.

Another influence working in the same direction is seen in the specialization of farm animals. These are now highly perfected meat producing machines. Almost any agricultural college can furnish a formula giving the exact amount of beef or pork that will be produced from feeding a certain amount of food to certain breeds of animals.

The substitution of other sources of power than that of animals, furthers the same line of progress. So long as any industry is dependent on animal power, it can never attain the factory stage. The use of the gasoline engine promises to have far reaching effect. It furnishes the power which, for the particular purpose of farming, is much more suitable than steam. The portability, simplicity and cheapness of this power make possible its application in many places where steam could never be used.

These mechanical changes are having the same effect in farming that they have in every line of industry. Concentration, while it does not follow the lines at first expected, now promises to follow the parallel line with industrial evolution much more closely. All the changes that have been mentioned greatly increase the amount of capital required for the farm unit.

This tendency is further accelerated by the constant and rapid increase in the price of land, even as a location. This increase is made more rapid by the disappearance of the world frontier. Free land is now a thing of the past, save in the most remote corners of the earth. This has been accompanied by a vast increase of urban population, thus adding still more to the demand for farm products, relative to the number of farmers.

The farm, when transformed into a factory, requires large investments of capital in many directions. Almost any acre of a modern, intensively cultivated market garden requires more capital than was demanded by the even larger farms of a generation ago.

Even the remnant of so-called free land now open requires large capital for its use. The day when penniless pioneers pressed out to the edge of civilization, there to create a farming unit, owned by each one individually, has passed. All the new projects for farmers require a capital such as is possessed by few farmers or wage laborers; consequently the present "Back to the Land" movement is largely one of small capitalists. Indeed, the amount required would not be considered small among capitalists of fifty years ago.

This rise in the price of land is transforming the coming generation of farmers into a race of renters. There is little possibility for resourceless workers to become farm owners. Here, again, the absence of recent statistics makes any definite statement impossible. A straw that suggests the course of events is found in the fact that the population of Iowa, almost the foremost agricultural state in the Union, is the only state showing an absolute decline in population during the last ten years. The state census, taken in 1905, showed this, and the preliminary estimates issued by the United States confirm the fact and show that the movement is of long duration. The local authorities agree that this is due to an increase in the size of the farm unit, a growth in the amount of capital required per farm, due to the rising price of land and the consequent emigration to Canada.

Thus this stage upon which we appear to be just entering presents all the phenomena made familiar in the competitive stage of the factory industry. It would thus appear to be a stage immediately preceding the entrance of great capital and the Trust into farming.

Along with this change is coming the change in the position of the farm laborer as distinct from the farm owner. We are beginning to see the same organization of industry that has long prevailed in the factory. Trained superintendents are being turned out of the Agricultural Colleges, and these are becoming the employers of unskilled men recruited from the city. As yet, this development has not proceeded far enough to present any practical questions for solution. Few things, however, are more striking than the great extension of agricultural education. The nation, state, and in a great many cases smaller political divisions, are constantly extending their activities in this direction.

These things are largely of the future. Little more than their beginnings are with us today. The industry of agriculture is not yet a factory industry, and the majority of the farmers are not yet in a position to accept the factory psychology. Yet, because they are moving in that direction they can be appealed to with Socialist philosophy much more effectively than before such tendencies were visible. Moreover, it is of the greatest importance that the Socialists should themselves be familiar with these new phases if the problems of the farmer are to be met in the Socialist program.

One thing should be well understood, in addition to the fact that the old idea of bonanza farms swallowing all others is not true, and that is that the Socialists of the world are unanimously agreed that no Socialist party proposes the immediate expropriation of the farm owner who is cultivating his own farm. Every European Socialist platform that mentions this subject agrees upon this point.

At the same time it is not for the Socialist party to guarantee the private ownership of any productive property. The laws of evolution forbid any such guarantee save so far as it applies to the products of the laborer. So long as tools are used merely by individual handicraftsmen they present no problem of ownership which the Socialist is compelled to solve. The same is true of land. Collective ownership is urged by the Socialist, not as an end in itself, not as a part of a utopian scheme, but as means of preventing exploitation, and wherever individual ownership is an agency of exploitation, then such ownership is opposed by Socialism.

One of the most encouraging phases of recent evolution is the closer relationship arising between farmers and wage-workers. This was inevitable, as they found themselves confronted by the same enemy.

This mutual approach is seen, not alone in the overtures being made to establish direct connection between organizations of farmers and of wage workers. This in itself is but an expression of the increasing identity of interest of the members of these organizations.

It is no longer a question of what the Socialists will do for, or to the farmers. It is doubtful if the question was ever properly stated in this manner. Socialists, least of all, can afford to come forward as saviors of other social classes. The farmers, however, are now definitely moving for themselves. They are moving in great masses and with fairly definite aims. They are going to have a voice in determining the tactics of any working class movement. At the same time it is well for both farmers and wage workers to bear in mind that the latter are the advance guard in the class struggle, that they are the peculiar product of capitalism, and that in every country they have played the part of pathfinders on the road to social revolution.

It is therefore of the greatest significance that within the last few years the farmers have shown a striking tendency to adopt the tactics that have proven successful in the fight of the wage workers. The tactics of the leading farmers' organizations of today are strikingly different from those of a generation ago. The methods pursued by the Farmers' Alliance and the Grange during the '80's are hardly suggested today in the councils of the American Society of Equity and the Farmers' Union.

The farmers' organizations of today seek by means of "controlled marketing" to determine the price of their product by methods familiar in the trade union world. Moreover, they are looking to direct co-operation with the unions in carrying out those methods. In so far as it is possible to do so without compromising Socialist principles, it is absolutely essential that the Socialist party work from the beginning in close co-operation with the efforts of the farmers to resist exploitation. We must not repeat the mistake which was made in the early days of the Socialist movement of this country in our relations with the trades unions.

When it comes to outlining definite steps to be taken by the Socialist party, we

are confronted with a mass of detailed difficulties and forced to recognize that there is no royal road to the goal we are seeking. There is no ready-to-order program that will insure co-operation with the farmers. There is no absolute certainty as to the steps along which we must proceed in this regard. We, in America, are not alone in this indefinite position. It is the position of every European Socialist party, many of which have worked for years upon this problem.

There are some things, however, that the more recent lines of evolution in agriculture would seem to suggest. The largest agricultural units at the present time are not to be found on great farms in remote districts. They are the great vegetable factories at the doors of the largest cities. It is probable that one of the largest farms in the world, measured by the amount of capital invested, is within the limits of the city of Chicago, and which has more than thirty acres under glass with artificial heat. This farm finds it possible to compete in the production of almost all agricultural products, save cereals, with farms located upon the edge of the tropics, or with any farms depending upon natural light, heat, water and soil elements.

The Socialists might well demand that such plant factories as these should be owned and operated by municipal or state governments. It is impossible to tell how far such establishments, if publicly owned, might be developed, and how far they might go toward solving many problems that now confront Socialist management of municipalities. It is also possible that such establishments may prove of value in educational work, and also in meeting the problem of the unemployed.

The demand that there be no further alienation of public lands, already in our platform, should be emphasized, and coupled with the demand that such lands be used, where practicable, for intensive agriculture. The swamp and irrigated lands, which are almost the only ones now in the public possession, are especially suited for this purpose.

The Socialists of other lands are unanimous in encouraging co-operative movements among farmers. These may be extended beyond the marketing of farm products to the ownership of farm machinery, breeding animals and the purchase of fertilizers.

The farmers have always agreed, in their organizations, that they desire government ownership of transportation and storage facilities. They would also welcome the proposal for collective ownership and operation of slaughter houses, packing establishments, and of all trusts that manufacture things used by the farmers.

If the line of evolution that has been referred to above is followed much further, it is probable that the rise in the price of land, making ownership more difficult, the increase in the size of the farm unit caused by the introduction of the factory system into farming and the need of the employment of large numbers of men continuously throughout the year in such establishments, will lead to the organization of farm laborers. Experience in other industries would indicate that this evolution must proceed for some years before such organizations become an important factor in social movements.

One thing that must be recognized by Socialists is, that any program that neglects the largest single division of the producing class can not rightly call itself a working class movement, and is certainly doomed to failure. It is, therefore, of the greatest importance that careful study be given to the question of co-operation with the farmers and that some plan of common action shall be developed.

The Socialists of Oklahoma are almost the only ones in this country who have made any serious effort to solve this problem. For such an effort they are entitled to the gratitude of the Socialists of the entire country. Without in any way giving it endorsement, the program which they have adopted is herewith submitted as offering suggestions born of experience and therefore more worthy of careful consideration than any that might spring from a purely theoretical and doctrinaire knowledge of the subject:

FARMERS' PROGRAM.

As measures calculated to bring into collective property the land, and enable the farmer to have the use and occupancy of the land sufficient for a home and the support of his family, we hereby advocate and pledge our elected officers to the following program:

ARTICLE 1.

Separation of the Department of Agriculture from the political government by means of:

Section 1. Election of all members and officers of the Board of Agriculture by the direct vote of the actual farmers.

Section 2. Introduction of the merit system among the employees.

ARTICLE 2.

Erection by the State of grain elevators and warehouses for the storage of farm products; these elevators and warehouses to be managed by the Board of Agriculture.

ARTICLE 3.

Organization by the Board of Agriculture of free agricultural education and the establishment of model farms.

ARTICLE 4.

Encouragement by the Board of Agriculture of co-operative societies of farmers:

Section 1. For the buying of seed and fertilizer;

Section 2. For the purchase and common use of implements and machinery;

Section 3. For the preparing and sale of produce;

Section 4. For the working of land by groups.

ARTICLE 5.

Organization by the State for loans on mortgages and warehouse certificates, the interest charges to cover cost only.

ARTICLE 6.

State insurance against diseases of animals, diseases of plants, insect pests, hail, flood, storm and fire.

ARTICLE 7.

Aid and encouragement to be given the actual workers of the farms in the formation of District Co-operative Associations which shall be given the power to issue bonds for the purchase of suitable farming lands—bonds to be redeemable in forty years. Individuals purchasing such lands shall pay the purchase price of land in share or cash annual or semi-annual rentals extending over a period of forty years, or may at their option pay in full in any given number of years.

ARTICLE 8.

Exemption from taxation and execution of dwellings, tools, farm animals, implements and improvements to the amount of one thousand dollars.

ARTICLE 9.

A graduated tax on the value of rented land and land held for speculation.

ARTICLE 10.

Absentee landlords to assess their own lands, the state reserving the right to purchase such lands at their assessed value plus ten per cent.

ARTICLE 11.

Land now in the possession of the state or hereafter acquired through purchase, reclamation or tax sales to be rented to landless farmers under the supervision of the Board of Agriculture at the prevailing rate of share rent or its equivalent. The payment of such rent to cease as soon as the total amount of rent paid is equal to the value of the land, and the tenant thereby acquires for himself and his children the right of occupancy. The title to all such lands remaining with the commonwealth.

SUGGESTIONS OF COMRADE LEE.

Throughout the greater part of the history of the United States (except in the South, where the existence of slavery produced special conditions, some of which have continued after the emancipation of the slaves), the generally prevalent type of agricultural producer was one which closely corresponded to that of the self-employed artisan in the field of industrial production. The typical American farmer was a man who owned, free of mortgage, a farm of moderate size, large enough to require for its cultivation practically all of his labor time, but not so large as to necessitate the employment of hired labor except on a small scale in busy seasons.

Under the influence of technical changes in industrial production, transportation, and exchange, the industrial artisan has become practically extinct, giving place

to the employing capitalist and the wage worker. The technical evolution of agriculture has gone on somewhat more slowly and under somewhat different forms. An examination of the available statistics, however, as well as common observation, shows that a series of changes are taking place, by which the classic type of American farmer is being displaced and new categories of agricultural producers are arising, with economic interests and social tendencies essentially different from those of the farmers above described.

A comparison of the census statistics of the year 1900 with those of 1890 and of earlier decades, shows that both large and small farms are increasing in proportionate number at the expense of those of moderate size. In 1890, the farms of less than 50 acres were about 29 per cent of the whole number of farms in the United States; in 1900, they numbered almost 34 per cent of the whole. The farms of 500 acres or more numbered 2.5 per cent of the whole in 1890 and 2.6 per cent in 1900. In 1890, out of every thousand farms in the United States, 289 were of less than 50 acres; in 1900, such small farms numbered 337 out of every thousand. The farms of 500 acres or more numbered 25 out of every thousand in 1890 and 26 out of every thousand in 1900. The number of farms between 50 and 500 acres was reduced during this period from 686 to 637 out of every thousand. The increase in small farms took place in every section of the country; the increase of large farms took place all over the North and West, but was partly counterbalanced by a reduction in the number of large farms in the South; the proportionate number of farms of medium size took place in all sections.

In 1890, out of every thousand farms, 284 were cultivated by tenants paying a rental in cash or on shares, and 716 were cultivated by their owners. In 1900, the number of rented farms had increased to 353, and the number cultivated by their owners had fallen to 647 in the thousand. The same tendency showed itself alike in the North, the South, and the West.

The proportion of farm families occupying mortgaged homes rose from 186 in the thousand in 1890 to 200 in the thousand in 1900. This change also seems to have taken place in all sections of the country alike.

In 1890, out of every thousand males at least ten years of age in the United States, 324 were reported as being engaged in agricultural pursuits. In 1900, the proportion was 317 out of every thousand. The statistics for previous decades, though they are less trustworthy than those for 1890 and 1900, confirm the impression that the agricultural population is declining in proportionate numbers. This decline, however, is very slow. The agricultural population will undoubtedly for many decades continue to constitute at least 30 per cent of the whole population of the country.

The composition of this agricultural population, however, is undergoing noteworthy changes. Socialist writers and speakers have been too prone to lump together the whole agricultural population as a single class, under the general designation of "farmer," or even to throw them in indiscriminately together with small tradesmen, business men, and professional persons, as constituting the "middle class." This classification is entirely misleading. The small capitalists in industry and commerce have economic interests and social tendencies very different from those of the agricultural elements. Nor does the agricultural population itself constitute one homogeneous class. On the contrary, it is divided into perhaps as many classes as are to be found in industrial society, though the class lines may not be quite so clearly drawn. We have to note the distinction between farmers and hired farm workers. The hired workers may be distinguished into at least two groups; the one represented by the old-fashioned "hired man," who is ordinarily the sole employee on a small or middle-sized farm where he works year after year, living with his employer virtually as one of the family; the other represented by the laborers of the Northwest, who work in gangs at harvesting, threshing, and other farm work part of the year, passing from farm to farm till the season is over, then in many cases going to work in the lumber camps during the winter, and perhaps passing from that to railway construction work the next year. The farmers, again, fall into several groups according to the size of their farms, the tenure by which they hold them (as free owners, as owners subject to mortgage, or as cash or share tenants), and according to the nature of the agricultural production which they carry on (whether for a local or an extended market; whether turning out a varied product or a special one; whether requiring much or little capital other than the land itself and many or few wage workers).

The changes in area and tenure of farms have already been noted—the increase

of tenancy and of mortgages and the decline in the proportion of middle-sized farms. While the use of machinery in agriculture proper has by no means had such revolutionary results as in the field of industrial production, and while the growth of large farms is very slow and their total number still comparatively small, yet both these factors and certain others have combined to cause a considerable increase in the employment of wage labor in agriculture.

The census of 1890 indicates that out of every thousand males engaged in agriculture, 342 were wage workers, and the census of 1900 indicates a proportion of 415 wage workers out of every thousand. In both years the proportion is probably somewhat too high, as the census undoubtedly classifies as "agricultural laborers" many farmers' sons working on their father's places, who are not wage workers in the strict sense of the term. It may be presumed, however, that this error would be about the same in both years, and that the increase from 342 to 415 accurately enough indicates the ratio in which the employment of wage labor in agriculture increased during the decade in question.

We thus have three antagonisms of economic interest in the field of agricultural production—the antagonism between tenant and landlord, between mortgagor and mortgagee, and between wage worker and employer; and all of these antagonisms are increasing in importance, with the increase in the number of tenants, or mortgagors, and of wage workers.

But this by no means exhausts the list of economic antagonisms in this field. Even more important, for the present, are those between the farmers (whether owners or tenants) and certain great capitalist interests.

With the partial exception of market gardeners and dairy and poultry farmers in the immediate neighborhood of cities of moderate size, all farmers are largely at the mercy of the railway companies and the owners of wheat elevators and other warehouses for the transportation and storage of their produce. As individual small shippers, they are practically helpless in face of the enormously rich and closely combined capitalist corporations which stand between them and their market. With the growth of the very large cities, which can not be supplied from within a radius of a few miles, even the producers of milk, poultry, eggs, vegetables and fruits are becoming more and more dependent upon such powerful middlemen. The producers of special products—cattle, sheep and swine, tobacco, sugar cane and sugar beets, etc.—are in an even worse position, since the concentration of industry has left them with virtually but a single purchaser in each of these lines—the Meat Trust, the Tobacco Trust, the Sugar Trust, etc., which are able to fix prices that leave them little if anything more than the barest subsistence wage for their labor after paying the cash expenses of operating their farms. Finally, all farmers have to purchase machinery and supplies, and here again the concentration of industry leaves them with virtually but a single seller in each line—the Harvester Trust, the Fertilizer Trust, the Cordage Trust, etc.—which can extort from them a monopoly price for everything they have to buy in order to carry on their farms.

✓ 1. The national ownership of the land has no place in our program of immediate demands. Whether, fifty or a hundred years hence, it will be found socially desirable that the land should be held as national property, that it should be held under some other form of social ownership, or some portions of it should be held as social property and other portions as the property of individuals, may be an interesting subject for academic discussion. If the technical evolution of agricultural production follows the same course as has been followed in industrial production, the time will undoubtedly come when some form of social ownership will be found necessary—ownership by the nation, by the states, by subdivisions of the states, or by co-operative societies. But for the present there is hardly even the beginning of such an evolution. Agricultural production is still essentially individual production by hand labor. The changes which have taken place in the economics of agriculture are the results chiefly of concentration in the processes of transportation and exchange and in industrial production; only to a very slight degree of the socialization of the processes of agricultural production itself. In the field of industry, what the Socialist movement demands is the social ownership and control of the **SOCIALLY OPERATED** means of production, not of **ALL** means of production. Only to a very small extent is the land now, only to a very small extent is it likely to be for many years to come, a socially operated means of production. Even to declare in any dogmatic manner that all the land must eventually become social property is

somewhat utopian; to demand that the ownership of all land shall be immediately socialized is to make ourselves ridiculous.

2. On the other hand, we should include in our immediate demands the retention by the nation and by the states respectively of such lands as they still own, and especially of forest lands, arid lands whose cultivation requires a centralized system of irrigation, etc.

3. In the interest, both of the farmers as producers and of the rest of the population as purchasers, we should lay emphasis upon the demand for the national ownership of the railways and the establishment by the nation (and, pending that, by any states in which we may have sufficient influence to effect it) of a system of public warehouses for the storage of all kinds of agricultural produce, the storage charges to be only sufficient to cover cost of operation and replacement, by which the farmer will be able to come into a more nearly direct relation with the consumers of his produce and to get a higher price for it while even reducing the price to the consumers.

4. We should encourage the formation of co-operative societies of various kinds—societies for the co-operative operation of creameries, cheese factories, and other productive enterprises of a simple nature which draw their raw materials directly from the farms; societies for the co-operative ownership of agricultural machinery and the co-operative purchase of fertilizers, binding twine, implements, and supplies of all sorts; and also societies of wage workers in the cities for the co-operative purchase of provisions and other goods, which can enter into relation with the farmers' societies and partially eliminate middlemen's profits, while at the same time cultivating a mutual understanding and sympathy between the industrial and the agricultural producers. This subject of co-operation should be worked out carefully, on the basis especially of European experience, in order to avoid the danger of the co-operative societies degenerating into mere business enterprises and to develop their socialistic tendencies.

5. We should have a series of special booklets and leaflets prepared for propaganda among the farmers, explaining in clear language the attitude of the Socialist movement, the benefits which it offers them, and the futility of their looking to either of the old parties for relief, or hoping to advance their interests by the organization of a new farmers' party without the aid of the wage workers.

6. We should seriously consider the practicability of carrying on a work of propaganda and organization among the agricultural wage workers—not the individual farmhands of the old type, but the actual proletarians who play so large a role in the agriculture of the Western States.

(Signed) ALGERNON LEE.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FARMERS' PROGRAM

1. Whether, fifty or a hundred years hence, it will be found socially desirable that the land should be held as national property, that it should be held under some other form of social ownership or some portions of it should be held as social property and other portions as the property of individuals, may be an interesting subject for academic discussion. In the field of industry, what the Socialist movement demands is the social ownership and control of the **SOCIALLY OPERATED** means of production, not of **ALL** means of production. Only to a very small extent is the land now, only to a very small extent is it likely to be for many years to come, a socially operated means of production. Even to declare in any dogmatic manner that all the land must eventually become social property is somewhat utopian; to demand that the ownership of all land shall be immediately socialized is to make ourselves ridiculous.

2. With the writers of the Communist Manifesto we agree in the principle of the "application of all rents of land to public purposes." To this end we advocate the taxing of all lands to their full rental value, the income therefrom to be applied to the establishment of industrial plants for the preparing of agricultural products for final consumption, such as packing-houses, canneries, cotton gins, grain elevators, storage and market facilities.

3. We should include in our immediate demands the retention by the nation and by the state respectively of such lands as they still own, and such as they may hereafter secure by reclamation, purchase, condemnation or otherwise:

such land to be organized into model state farms and various forms of collective agricultural enterprises, as far and as fast as practical under capitalistic development.

4. In the interest both of the farmers as producers and of the rest of the population as purchasers, we should lay emphasis upon the demand for the national ownership of the railways and the establishment by the nation (and, pending that, by any states in which we may have sufficient influence to effect it) of a system of public warehouses for the storage of all kinds of agricultural produce, the storage charges to be only sufficient to cover cost of operation and replacement, by which the farmer will be able to come into a more nearly direct relation with the consumers of his produce and to get a higher price for it while even reducing the price to the consumers.

ENCOURAGING CO-OPERATION.

5. We should encourage the formation of co-operative societies of various kinds—societies for the co-operative operation of creameries, cheese factories, and other productive enterprises of a simple nature which draw their raw materials directly from the farms; societies for the co-operative ownership of agricultural machinery and the co-operative purchase of fertilizers, binding twine, implements, and supplies of all sorts; and also societies of wage-workers in the cities for the co-operative purchase of provisions and other goods, which can enter into relation with the farmers' societies and partially eliminate middlemen's profits, while at the same time cultivating a mutual understanding and sympathy between the industrial and the agricultural producers. This subject of co-operation should be worked out carefully, on the basis especially of European experience, in order to avoid the danger of the co-operative societies degenerating into mere business enterprises and to develop their socialistic tendencies.

6. The creation of a system of state credit for the purpose of loaning money direct to farmers without the intervention of private banks. It is possible that this may at least partially be covered by the extension of the co-operative movement to the field of banking.

7. State and national insurance against diseases of animals or plants, insect pests and natural calamities.

8. We should have a series of special booklets and leaflets prepared for propaganda among the farmers, explaining in clear language the attitude of the Socialist movement, the benefits which it offers them, and the futility of their looking to either of the old parties for relief or hoping to advance their interests by the organization of a new farmers' party without the aid of the wage workers.

9. We should seriously consider the practicability of carrying on a work of propaganda and organization among the agricultural wage workers—not the individual farm hands of the old type, but the actual proletarians who play so large a role in the agriculture of the Western States.

BY THE COMMITTEE.

DEL. SIMONS: I move the adoption of the committee's report. (Seconded.) I hope you will allow me about three minutes, not to argue.

WOMAN'S COMMITTEE.

The tellers then reported the vote on the Woman's Committee, as follows: Lewis, 46; Simons, 69; Branstetter, 69; Lowe, 51; Malkiel, 59; Prevey, 58; Laukki, 45; Maynard, 45.

The vote for Delegates Laukki and Maynard being a tie, on motion the vote was decided by a show of hands, resulting as follows: Laukki, 42; Maynard, 28.

FARMERS' PROGRAM.

Consideration of the Farmers' question was resumed.

DEL. SIMONS: All I wish to say is to look over the program and consider it largely in the light of progress, because we do not claim to know it all. There is a delegate here who is thoroughly acquainted with both the literature and the practical side of the farm question, and I want you to hear Comrade Ameringer, and if you have to take it out of my time, give him at least fifteen minutes to talk to you on this line. I do not know whether he wants to speak now.

DEL. AMERINGER: Not now.

DEL. BURKE (N. H.): I am one of those delegates who have taken up but little of the congress' time, and I am not going to speak at any great length on the farmers' program. What I would like, would be to hear the actual workers in the agricultural districts speak upon this question, and let the comrades, that do not know anything about the question, keep still for a little while. This congress is costing me about \$6 a day. I work as a carpenter, and, of course, you know a carpenter cannot afford to lose five or six dollars a day. I want to get back to the old Granite State, and I hope the people that know something about this question will do the talking and that the others will keep still. (Applause.)

DEL. CLYDE J. WRIGHT (Neb.): A point of information. Do I understand that this last document read by Comrade Simons, constitutes what this congress goes on record as endorsing as a farmers' program?

DEL. SIMONS: It is simply a series of recommendations. I could not say that it will constitute a part of our platform. It is simply a report of the committee, and its recommendations, unless put in the platform, would not, according to my understanding, bind the Socialist Party. I may be mistaken, and frequently have been, but those are suggestions. I do not believe the committee have gone far enough to know where they stand.

DEL. WRIGHT: Then, on what kind of a record will this conference be placed when we go back and talk about the action of this body? What will we say we have done? Simply suggested? Is that the idea?

DEL. SIMONS: I think that is all. You cannot place it in the platform unless the platform committee does something. That is the only committee that has power to bind us.

DEL. COLLINS (Colo.): I want to state that I am a member of a farmers' grange, and I know something of the development of the great farms of the west. I have been a member of a grange for the last three or four years, and I get the bulk of my living out of agricultural products. I want to say that the farmers' grange of the west is to-day breaking loose from its old political surroundings, and that we ought to take some more definite position than this on this question, either by some different resolution or something else, possibly; because the farmers' movement is, I believe, something it never was before, and has not been in the state of Colorado. It is breaking loose everywhere, and if

we do not consider this question a little more seriously we are liable to make a mistake in the near future, especially when you see such a gathering as the one in St. Louis last week, showing that the farmers are looking towards political action.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): Will you allow me to make a suggestion? It occurs to me that we can get through with that very quick under the rule, if you will remember that the best we can do in this congress is to make some general suggestions, and then let each state work out its programme as the Oklahoma comrades have done. If you will endorse a general proposition such as the report presents, and then leave it to each State, you will find that each State has a different practical agricultural problem, and you will perceive that Oklahoma has worked out its programme, and we have printed that in the report.

DEL. KAPLAN (Minn.): A point of information. Do you mean the suggestion as to the farmers' programme?

DEL. THOMPSON: No, I mean the general report of the committee.

DEL. KAPLAN: I would like to see some suggestions endorsed, but I for one would not stand for that part where it says what we are going to have fifty or one hundred years hence. Now, I take the position as a materialist Socialist, that we will have Socialism realized before fifty or a hundred years hence, and that this congress ought not to go on record as waiting for fifty years hence for such a proposition. There is something else to be done than that.

DEL. AMERINGER (Okla.): Friends and Comrades, everybody came to this congress to get something. It is a kind of a family reunion. One of the boys wants a new typewriter when he goes home, and one of the girls wants to get married, just as the boys from Oklahoma want a land programme. Now, we have worked out a Socialist programme to the satisfaction of the Oklahoma movement. Our movement is composed of at least 90 per cent farming farmers, I do believe, Comrades, and the reason why we brought that up here before you was to get the opinions of some of the wise men on this Oklahoma programme. But I see no one who has a better thing than we have got, and so I will just talk on it for a very few minutes.

In the first place, friends, we have in the past accepted the idea that the agricultural industry would be concentrated and hammered down and boiled down until we have great financial farms, owned

by a few capitalists and operated by hundreds of thousands of wage slaves. I want to say to you, friends, that in the United States of America there is not the slightest symptom that that sort of evolution in agriculture is taking place. We have two tendencies in agriculture, one forward towards capitalism, and the other backward toward feudalism, and the principal tendency, I might say nine-tenths of the tendency, is not onward towards capitalism, but backward towards feudalism. I mean in the ownership of land by a master class; the worker on the land being exploited just as the feudal serf was exploited by his lord. The land is not passing into the hands of the large capitalist class. The land is passing into the hands of the small fry capitalists. We find that between 1880 and 1900 farm renters, that is, cash renters, increased from 8 to 13 per cent. From 1880 to 1900 we find the share renters increased from 17 to 22 per cent. We find that in the same twenty years the mortgaged farmer has increased from 53 to 55 per cent. We find everywhere that the soil is passing into the hands of the small fry capitalist class, and that the land is owned by the capitalistic financial bosses to exploit the renting class.

Now, it is the aim of the Oklahoma movement to do three things. Fundamentally the Socialist stands for this one thing: To give to the working people the product of their labor. Incidentally we want the ownership by the working people of the means of production. What we Socialists want to do is to bring about a union, a marriage between ownership and labor. We want this marriage between ownership and labor in order to give the working class the product of their labor. In the case of the farming farmer there is a perfect union, there is a perfect marriage between ownership and labor. That farmer owns the means with which he makes his living. The Socialist would not disturb that relationship. In the case of the farmer who farms the farm the Socialist movement has no right to interfere with that relationship. But just as the shoemaker and the cabinet-maker have lost their means of life, so the farmer is losing his means of life. Now, the question for the Socialist Party is this: Shall we Socialists stand still; shall we be indifferent to the change of the farmer from an owner into a renter, or shall we do something in that respect? Now, the farmer is exploited in three ways. First, he is exploited by the owners of the large means of production and distribution. He is exploited through the

usury of the banks that are farming the farmer, and he is exploited by the owner of the land. Now, what we Socialists want to do is to put an end to exploitation. Do we not? Therefore, we want the farmers to own the farms. We want them to be the owners of the means of production. We want to make it so that the farmer also can get the use of capital without being robbed by a usury class.

I believe that the proposition of your committee covers this in a broad manner. In Oklahoma, we have 60 per cent of all our farmers renters. The programme here would bring about a condition where it would be impossible for the man who does not work land to own land, and it would improve the condition of our 200,000 renters in Oklahoma at least thirty per cent. That is a thing that is worth while striving for. Many of the farmers in the southwest, where I am acquainted, have a good many co-operatively managed enterprises. They have started co-operative general stores, they have started co-operative mills, and they are going into the co-operative business down there. The farmer is recognizing the fact that he must be the owner of all the means with which he works.

Now, what do we Socialists want to do? Do we want the common ownership of all land? No. What for? We have the common ownership of land in Oklahoma—of three million acres of school land. It is common property, and the farmer is a renter on the state land. The relationship is the most unsatisfactory you can imagine, for the farmer does not hold the land long enough to improve it by dwellings. All he does, is to exploit the soil and then move off afterwards. He has not created a home on the exploited soil. We do not want that, if we can help it. That common ownership of land we had in one way among our Indians down Oklahoma. The thing we want to do is to give the land to the man who uses the land. The fellow who doesn't use land—God bless his heart, he doesn't need any. The fellow who uses land as a means of exploitation is a pure and unadulterated holdup man. The landlord class is furnishing the land. If that class never had been born there wouldn't be any land. (Laughter.) If the land owners of the United States would die to-night and go to heaven they would take the land down with them, and there would be a hole in the ground where their land used to be. If there is one class of people that absolutely fulfills no social function whatever, it is the landlords. The industrial capitalist as manager and

superintendent has done something and is doing something, but the landlord does absolutely nothing. He is a block in the wheel of progress. He must be eliminated. (Applause.)

Let us make the fight clean and clear between the landless farmers and the farmer who farms the farmer. We in Oklahoma want every farmer who owns land and farms his land to keep it, and the more he works and produces, the better for us, and the more he improves it the better for mankind. We want him to hang on to it. All we want to do is to do away with the fellow who furnishes the land to the farmer; that gentleman who, like the promoters, furnish the ocean provided the others furnish the ship. (Laughter.)

Now, on this proposition we have a great fight all over the United States, for I believe, you have a renters' problem in Illinois; that I do know. I am satisfied that half of your farmers in Illinois are renters to-day. You will find in Wisconsin, where we have a foreign population, that a great many of the farmers up there are renters. Now, if you eliminate the landlord class, if you make the fight against the land owner, whom have you got lined up against you? Somebody that nobody loves. Nobody cares anything for the landlord. He is even a parasite on the industrial capitalists. And if we can divide the opposing forces, if we can divide the capitalist class into the industrial class and the land owning class, let us lick one division at a time instead of butting into both of them at the same time.

Friends, I ask you to adopt this report. We would like to go back to Oklahoma and keep on working with our programme. It is not perfect. We will make it better and better all the time. Each state should try to do the same thing, for I do believe that, if you fight it out on the broad line of "Land for the landless, and he who doesn't use land doesn't get any," that you are going to have the farmers who farm the farms, the renters who rent the farms, and the working people in the towns, and every fair-minded man who does not make his living through the exploitation of the landless man, on your side. I thank you. (Applause.)

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I would like to ask the last speaker, when was the last piece of land thrown open to the public in Oklahoma? He says that 60 per cent of the land workers there are land poor. I would like to get that point so that I can make an argument among the workers in the east.

DEL. AMERINGER: I can explain that very easily. In the first place, half of Oklahoma is the old Indian Territory. In the Indian Territory the land belonged to the Indians until a few years ago, when Congress removed the restriction on the land and the Indians can sell the land. Now, when it came to the time for the Indian to sell his land, it turned out that he had sold it five, six, seven, eight times over before the restriction ever was removed. That Indian, who was not acquainted with this beautiful institution of the private ownership of mother earth, didn't know any better, so when the white man would come along with a jug of whiskey or half a hog the Indian would give that man a chunk of that land. The Indian always had an idea that the land belonged to the same fellow who owned the air and water and sunshine. In Oklahoma these fellows began to buy the land and lease the land of the Indians before the restriction was removed. Now they have got the title, and some of those fellows have the title to some of the best Indian land. The renters on the Indian lands used to fare pretty well with the Indians, who didn't know anything about the beauties of Christian civilization and didn't think it was right to ask anybody anything for the use of that land, and so when any one would ask for it he would let the fellow have the land. But just as soon as the other man, the civilized Christian, got hold of the land the renter began to fare differently. As long as the Indian owned the land the white man got his land reasonable. Now the Indian doesn't have it, the white man owns it, and he squeezes the life out of the renter. This is responsible for the rebellion down in Oklahoma. That is the economic basis for our great Socialist movement in that state.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: I believe I voice the sentiments of the committee when I say so far as I am concerned, and I think the others will agree, that we do not care to make any fight on this question. We would rather it would simply be laid on the table. The report is simply put before you for your consideration. However, if you insist on a discussion, all right; I shall never fight to prevent it. It is simply putting something before you that represents the position of the committee.

DEL. MORGAN: I wish to discuss this because I want to see whether we want to adopt peasant proprietorship, the same as they have in Ireland. I am opposed to it. I am in favor of standing by

the Socialist programme. I am opposed to private ownership of land in Chicago, in Oklahoma, or anywhere else. (Applause.) I want to call your attention to the fact here that this recommendation in this report deals absolutely with private property, private owners of land, at least, and it is introduced to save them from extinction and to try to link this great class with the Socialist movement, and there is no mention made of the wage workers who help to cultivate this land. I was very much interested in the talk of the comrade that comes from this new state in the west, Oklahoma. I have hardly got acquainted with him, but at least the comrade interests me. But if these are the recommendations, I am opposed to them. A lot of new men, that have just become private property owners, that have organized to protect themselves, have decided, mind you, that the wage workers in those states shall be treated as servants. The Socialist Party is organized for the purpose of abolishing the relationship of master and man and the wage system, not organized to keep up the establishment of master and man, either in the business or industrial production or in the business of agriculture. We want private property wiped out for the farmer as well as for every other class. I want to tell you that away back in the Irish land agitation Michael Davitt and the other Irishmen organized the Land League, and I and other Englishmen in Chicago, removed 4,000 miles, became their voluntary aids, mind you, and we sent \$1,700 over to Ireland to aid Michael Davitt's programme of abolishing private property in land. And when Parnell came here with his programme of peasant proprietorship the Socialists of Chicago had a parade 50,000 strong and a mass meeting repudiating Parnell and all his peasant proprietorship and standing for the abolition of private property in land. And now, twenty years later, we have got a Socialist convention that is going to support the little farmers in Oklahoma and forget the wage workers who work the farms. (Applause.)

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): I did intend to move the previous question, but I will not do it under the circumstances. I cannot accept the report of this committee. I cannot accept this report of this committee as a member of the Socialist Party. I do not believe in the right of ownership of private property to the detriment of society. That is what, as I understand, this report will imply. The comrade from Oklahoma says we want the farms to be

farmed by the men who own the farms. Now, I do not want the farmers to own the farms any more than I want the masters to own the private penitentiaries that you are compelled to work in. Part of the farmers own all the farms under the capitalist system. The men that work the farms get very little of them. We find that the United States Census report states there are 20,264,286 farming farmers in this country. We contend as Socialists that our unit of production to-day will be equivalent to \$3,000. If we stood for the programme of private ownership of farms and that the farmer should get the product of his farm to-day, the amount he would get on the present basis would be about \$1,800, so that you are beating him out of \$1,200 on a reasonable basis under the co-operative commonwealth. I do not believe that the Socialist movement, including all of its elements, has given the land question sufficient study to definitely determine our attitude in this congress. I do not believe the members of this committee will disagree with that position. But to go on record as standing for any element in society, especially that which society as a whole must depend upon for its life, the land, I positively will not vote for it. In conclusion, I trust that some one will move a continuation, and if necessary an enlargement of this committee for the serious study of this question, and to bring back a more favorable and better report to a future convention. But I trust that this congress, in the moment or in the period of an impulsive act, will not vote for the private ownership of anything. If we do we may just as well go out of business, and say that we stand for private ownership of all the means of life with a view of having a number of exploiters instead of a few as we have it to-day.

DEL. T. J. LEWIS (Ore.): Why don't we get up also a document, saying that we believe in the private ownership of shop, mill and factory? We might as well do it. What are you going to do? Are you going to try and bring the farmer and the wage worker together? Do you know to-day that the greatest battle on the coast is not between the foreigner and the American? The greatest battle on the coast to-day is between the farmer and the wage worker. I will tell you about the farmer. Don't play too strong into his hands. When the farmer wants help, who is the greatest enemy to organized labor, but the farmer? He is the fellow that will reduce wages. He is the

fellow that encourages employment offices and agents upon the coast. He is the fellow that will go and fight the poor working man along the railroad. He is the fellow that gets enacted a little statute to crush workmen and get them into jail, and then come back to work them on the farms. That is the fellow. (Applause.) And I will tell you, you want to watch what you are doing to endorse Oklahoma. You may as well endorse the little business man. If the working class has got any enemy at all in the United States it is the farmer and the business man. Why, the idea!! What is this? Have you come to be reformers?

It looks that way. I thought we represented the working class.

We are supposed to represent the bourgeoisie, and we don't represent them, and I am afraid we don't represent anything. Very true indeed, we do not. Why? Because we are too cowardly, too mean to represent anything. That is true. We are afraid to be men and women. Why? We want to toady to the farmer, we want to toady to the sky pilot, we want to toady to the little business man, we want to be respectable. To hell with your respectability. (Applause.) I say that this is a revolutionary party and stands for the proletariat and the working class. What are you going to do? Play like a lot of parrots? Play to Mrs. Belmont and August Belmont? Is that what you want? The idea of such a thing; I never heard anything like it. I will tell you, anybody that is connected with the working class who would try to endorse a thing like that, I say, take your book and tear it up and throw your button in the ditch. I don't belong to the working class if you endorse a thing like that. (Applause.)

DEL. KUMMERFELD (Mich.): After listening to the report of the committee and after the talk from the comrade from Oklahoma, one is led to believe that in the entire states of the United States where we have farms there is not a single solitary laborer employed upon the farms. One is led to believe that, as the report does not mention the farm laborer, the attitude of the party toward the farm laborer was one of indifference.

A DELEGATE: Yes, it is in the last sentence.

DEL. KUMMERFELD: You cannot find it. You use about ten inches for the farmer, and then you have it down below there somewhere where it is pretty hard to find. It doesn't amount to anything anyway. Now, I am going to ask the comrade from Oklahoma about what per-

centage of the farmers in that state employ farm laborers?

DEL. AMERINGER: I can answer that. We have in Oklahoma itself no farm labor problem. Our farmers do not employ labor.

DEL. KUMMERFELD: We have it, then. Now, I would like to know further what percentage of the farm owners of the United States employ farm labor, and about how many farm laborers are employed upon the farms of the United States. Absolutely there is a problem there. That is the proposition that ought to have been reported upon to this congress and not our attitude toward the farm owners. I don't care a snap for them.

DEL. CLYDE J. WRIGHT (Neb.): I believe that I have a right to talk upon this question. I have not tired you with my presence heretofore, chiefly for the reason that I was waiting for this programme to be brought up. I am the lone representative of the Socialist party from the greatest agricultural state in the Union, the state of Nebraska.

A DELEGATE: How about Kansas?

DEL. WRIGHT: Well, we might match on that, but I will not concede it until you show me. Now then, I do not feel competent to discuss all phases of the Socialist movement that have been presented here. The question of immigration was a question I did not understand. Therefore I kept my mouth shut. The question of agriculture is a question which I believe I do understand. In our state we have a Socialist Party, not the largest, but just as solid, just as progressive, just as revolutionary as that of any other state of the Union. Of the dues-paying membership of that state, 90 per cent are farmers. We have raised in the state of Nebraska during the last fifteen months over \$4,000 in money for the propagation of Socialism, and 94 per cent of it came from farmers. (Applause.) In our convention in Lincoln last year, if you could have been there you would have heard clean-cut, revolutionary Socialism, where 90 per cent of the delegates to that convention were farmers. If you think you can go out into the agricultural districts of the state of Nebraska and hand the farmer a sop, you are going to be mistaken. He has read. In the western country we have the progressive element of the farmer population of the United States. The conservative easterner on the farm stayed at home. In the western farmer's home you will find newspapers and books, the best on the So-

cialist philosophy. He goes into town as up-to-date as the residents of any city of the west, who are just as up-to-date as those of any city of the east. He is informed on these questions. And I want to say this, that I was also pleased, and it was true with our vote on the immigration problem: That the logical thing for this body to do, instead of men standing up on their feet and talking about the farmer programme and suggesting to this congress that they are not able to decide, they should at least be able to say something educational themselves. I do not believe we are prepared to handle this problem. Honestly, I do not. I believe it would be the logical method of procedure to let this lie over, because such arguments as have been presented in the main on this question indicate an utter lack of appreciation of the economic problem of the farmer. He constitutes a wonderfully large percentage of our voting population, and in the west he is the most devoted and enthusiastic supporter of the Socialist programme. To say that this farmer is a traitor to the working class movement of the Socialist Party is an infamous lie. (Applause.) The farmer I am talking about is the farmer who is a Socialist. There may be farmers who would scab on you by coming into town, and you have got them without coming into town. There may be farmers who do not carry out all the ideas of boosting so much in vogue in the commercial world to-day, but I want to tell you that when you brand the Socialist farmer as that kind of an individual you are telling an absolute untruth.

A DELEGATE: Who branded them that way?

DEL. WRIGHT: Comrade Lewis.

A DELEGATE: Nothing of the kind.

DEL. WRIGHT: He did not make any exception. He said the farmer. Now, then, to understand this problem is not a matter of a few minutes' study. You have got to confront the situation, not only by book education, but by actual experience and contact with the farmers themselves. (Applause.) Statistics tell you absolutely no story on this problem at all. You cannot intelligently comprehend it until you have actual contact with their particular environment, just the same as any iron worker in this house will say to the farmer that you cannot comprehend the situation and the environment of the iron worker until you live among your tenement districts or make a personal investigation of his

surroundings. I do not know that I am going to make an argument in favor of the programme or against it. I really believe that the proper course of procedure for us to take at this time is to leave this matter lie over until you have studied it more, until the committee has studied it more. Furthermore, the committee has told the truth in this: That it is hardly possible to define the economic form that the farmer problem is going to take. It is simply commencing to travel upon the road of its particular evolution, and that evolution seems to be tending in just as many different directions as we have different particular environments. Every farmer who comes here to speak upon this question to-day—and you watch the farmer who speaks, not the industrial man, he is not yet sufficiently informed, just as the farmer is not informed on the industrial problem—but you will see in the argument of every farmer coming from the different directions, reflected an argument that points out a different agricultural problem, different in its makeup and pursuing a different course. Out in Nebraska we have the peculiar development of the exporting merchant, the harvester machine agent, the feeder, the ranchman, the farmer, the hog raiser and the politician all blended into one.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: A point of information. I understand the chair to rule that I had lost my opportunity to close the debate?

THE CHAIRMAN: You have.

DEL. SIMONS: Then I have a right to ten minutes as a member on the floor?

DEL. A. M. LEWIS (Ill.): I want to make a motion on this question to this effect: I move that the report of this committee be sent back to the committee for further consideration and for a further and more complete report at the next convention.

DEL. SIMONS: Will you permit an amendment? That that committee be increased to either five or some other number. There are only three left.

DEL. A. M. LEWIS: I will put that in the motion, and that the committee be increased to nine; that this subject be referred back to the committee for further consideration, to report at the next convention, and that the committee be increased to nine. (Seconded.)

DEL. MORGAN: Won't you add the words, "That the committee be wage workers?"

DEL. A. M. LEWIS: I will leave that to the judgment of the congress, as to who the committee shall be.

DEL. MORGAN: Then I move that they be wage-workers.

DEL. A. M. LEWIS: I accept the motion. I merely want to say that I think the next convention will have a right to expect that a committee of nine will have a more complete report and will be in a position to take some definite position on this question at the next convention. It would probably be unfair to criticise the present committee for the lack of definiteness of view on this subject. I do not suppose there is a more difficult question confronting the Socialists of the country than the question of agriculture. We have probably about the most backward Socialist movement of the world. The Germans are the best informed and have the most skillful Socialist movement of the world, and yet the Germans have not solved this problem. I am informed, and I have reason to believe informed correctly, that the Germans, in spite of being able to carry the industrial cities and the metropolitan cities, have not yet been able to carry the agricultural districts. The agrarian problem is one of the most difficult before us. We have heard from experts on this question, from Oklahoma and from Nebraska, and the Nebraska delegate acknowledges that in his judgment we are not prepared, and even the delegate from Nebraska is not prepared to give us any definite position for which we should stand. I haven't any very great faith in the farmer as he stands to-day. Talk about his reading newspapers and the best books, that does not fit with my experience of the farmer. I tried to sell Socialist books a hundred times to audiences of the farmer, and it is a discouraging business. I am not going to try it any more; life is too short. The farmer does not buy books to any noticeable extent. The farmer does not have the Socialist psychology. He does not live in a capitalist environment. The American farmer to-day, it is true, is not so backward as the farmer of the old countries, because the farmer of the old countries has always been a farmer; his fathers and his grandfathers and his forefathers were farmers. But the farmers of this country have been drawn from the cities. Some of them have come out of the mines, and they have not a long ancestry of farmers behind them, and consequently they have something of the wage-workers' psychology, and the farmer problem will probably not be as difficult in this country as abroad. But it is too difficult for us at present. We

are not prepared, we have not formulated our views, and we do not know where we stand. We are uncertain, we are not direct, and until we know better what to do and how to do it, in my opinion this motion is the only proper motion, that this body lay it over and take a scientific attitude. If we do not know what to do to-day, we should wait until we do know. (Applause.)

DEL. BELL (Tex.): I am not a farmer, and I do not know that I have heard a farmer speak yet. Therefore, I am not going to pretend to be speaking as a farmer. The comrade who spoke for Oklahoma is a musician from Columbus, Ohio, I believe, and is not a practical farmer. But while I am also a musician, I have been for nearly five years in daily and hourly correspondence with farmers, and therefore I know the farmers' feelings on these questions, the feelings of the Texas farmers. Now, who is the farmer?

I am very sure, from what I have heard here this morning, that those of us who are speaking of the farmer do not know what they are speaking of. They do not know which farmer they are speaking of. There is only one kind of farmer, and that is the man who farms the farm, and that is the man that is involved in this question. Those are the numerous ones in the farming country. Those are the bulk of the population, the ones that are farming the soil. Now, I want to tell you that the farmer that most of you have had in mind here is not in Texas; at least we do not call him a farmer in Texas; the farmer that most of you have in mind. I believe that Comrade Ameringer, in response to a question, "How much employing does the farmer do?" made the statement that they don't employ any labor, these farmers that he is speaking of. We haven't got that farmer exactly that he referred to in Oklahoma. Now, if you are going to have private ownership of your farms, you first have to give the farm to the farmer, because he hasn't got it. If you go to some of the farms in Texas you will find a public school and a county seat, with a creamery and over the establishment a First National Bank sign. We have in Texas 244 little Irelands. I want to state that I don't want to talk long on this. I don't intend to talk long, and I don't think we ought to talk on it at all. I don't think it ever ought to have come up, and I think I am reflecting the spirit of the comrades from Texas when I tell you that we want no farmers' programme. I will object to Comrade

Lewis's motion on the ground that that is a future consideration of the subject. I want it to take proper course in the congress; dismiss this thing here as quick as you can and get it out of the way, because the Texas farmer doesn't want anything but Socialism.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): I am a member of this committee, and I have been for three or four years. I am opposed to this motion to refer. I think we ought to settle it here. But there is one fact; it seems to me we want to make a very strong protest against an apparent opinion of some comrades here that this report, as suggested, is foolish or unscientific. The comrade who spoke a moment ago said that this is nonsense and foolish and so on. Now, there is not a single proposition in that printed programme that is before you which has not been put forth by such men as August Bebel, William Liebknecht, Franz Vollmar and a dozen or fifteen others of the best and most real revolutionary Socialists in the world to-day. (Applause.)

Now, can we in America not stand up and look one problem fairly in the face, the way they do in other countries, and consider it? That is not foolish. It would be foolish to do anything else. Here is our proposition. A programme has been drawn up. I think the attitude of the committee in this matter is a very reasonable one. We say: Here is a great problem. We say that this situation has been studied very thoroughly by our comrades in other countries. I hold in my hand now, as I did two years ago, a pamphlet on this question prepared by the men whose names I mentioned a moment ago, the result of their most careful, thoroughgoing consideration. Now I say we ought to be able and willing to get right down to brass tacks on a proposition like this, and study it and find out about it; and as Comrade Lewis suggested—and I agree with it—so far as we know let us say; so far as we do not know let us say we do not know. Let us proceed to face it and keep ourselves in line until we do find out. Let us hear from Nebraska, Texas, Oklahoma, Maine, Massachusetts, Oregon, Mississippi and New Jersey.

Now, I want to call your attention to another thing. The farmers' programme is a part of the Socialist movement, of the Socialist philosophy and Socialist principle. A comrade a moment ago ridiculed as nonsense this whole thing. I wonder if he knows that forty members went to the Second Duma in Russia on

this very programme that we are proposing here. (Applause.) If he does not know that, then he ought to find out, and we ought to find out that the farmers' programme is a part of the International Socialist movement. It is one of the things that they are grappling with and wrestling with everywhere, and I propose that we grapple with it and wrestle with it. If the comrades are not satisfied with the wrestling and grappling that we have done now, all right, send it back to our committee and we will grapple with it and wrestle with it some more. But let us not forget that the future of our movement depends upon the farmers, and the day that we get the farmers into the Socialist movement it can carry the country. We must do it. The future of the party in America depends on it. Let us get busy on this problem and find out the truth, and if it takes from now until the next national convention, I am with you on that proposition. (Applause.)

DEL. CUMBIE (Okla.): I want to say that the reason I am on this rostrum now is because I was approached a while ago and asked by the comrades to make a short talk. And I want to say that I believe our comrade last upon the floor sounded the keynote of the future of the Socialist Party, in my judgment, when he made the statement that the future success, in the last analysis, of the Socialist movement in America depends on the interest of the agriculturists of this nation. I was sorry to find injected into the discussion this afternoon anything that looked like the belittling of the idea of some programme representing the agriculturists of our states. When I leave here, I hope to go back to Oklahoma and be able to tell the farmers of Oklahoma, the men who are struggling under the conditions of landlordism, that I have something to say encouraging to them. I am going to talk just a little about some of the practical results following the adoption of this nonsensical, frivolous, thoughtless proposition, as our Oklahoma programme has been announced. And by way of correction, I want to say that I think it comes with ill grace from comrades from states that have never attempted to give us any kind of a programme, to get up and ridicule ours. We have done the best we could. We have made a small beginning, and I want to say to you to-day, that is the result of the small beginning along the line of this farmers' programme. The farmers of Oklahoma are flocking to the standard of Socialism as never before. (Applause.)

In Stevens County, Oklahoma, recently it was my pleasure to do twenty days' work, and in a certain special agricultural district of that county I organized 108 members into the Socialist locals of that county, and out of the 108 there were 102 that were actual working farmers on farms. My comrade has told you that 90 per cent of our members in Oklahoma are agriculturists. In closing I want to repeat and reiterate the statement of the comrade last upon the floor, that the final analysis and the last analysis of the Socialist movement in our nation must hinge upon the agriculturist of our nation. His is the hand that feeds the world, and though you may be very anxious, as I myself would be desirous of success, it will not come from conflict upon the battlefield or on the field of bullets. I believe that our object, the final goal of Socialism, will be reached along another line, "The dream of Debs," if you please, in regard to this movement. And when the final fight is made and we get the agriculturists enlisted in the movement, then it is an easy proposition to take care of the other fellows, because the farmer feeds them all. I thank you. (Applause.)

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I believe the Socialist Party pretends to represent the working class. If it does not, I want to get out of it. There is nothing in the Socialist platform that denies the right of a man to have enough ground to make a living out of. It says nowhere that, if a man works on a farm, he is necessarily a capitalistic exploiter; and if a man lives on a farm and works on that farm to get a living he does not necessarily thereby become a capitalist. He is a working man.

Now, it has been said by the delegates from Oklahoma that most of the men who are farmers in Oklahoma are the men who work the land. I don't object to a man owning land enough to make a living. I do object to one class exploiting another class by a wage system, whether he employs that exploited class to work on a machine or on the land. As I understand the Oklahoma proposition, it is that the people who are organized into the Socialist Party are men that have settled on the land and work it and do not depend upon a wage working class to make their living. Plenty of us here might be considered middle class, but that does not prevent us thinking straight and being class conscious. Our party is working against exploitation, and if the farmers of Oklahoma are not exploiting

anybody then they cannot be considered middle class capitalists. But the farmers as a class are being exploited by several parties, the landlord, the railroad, the middle men generally. Now the question is here: If we can go with the farm element and frame up a programme on which we can stand with the farmers and the farmers are willing to hew close to the line, and condemn exploitation, and go with the working class, all well and good, but if they cannot do that we don't want them.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I feel very much interested in this question for two reasons. In the first place Wisconsin is overwhelmingly agricultural. It is the first butter and cheese state in the union. New York used to have the honor of being the first cheese state, Illinois being the first butter state; but Wisconsin has passed them both. Your good Elgin butter is Wisconsin butter.

As early as 1898 I got a farmers' programme through the Socialist convention. But you should have seen the storm it raised. It was downed by a referendum. Ever since then I have felt the necessity of this party getting into touch with the farmers. And our party needs and must have a farmers' programme, even sooner than the Socialist Party of any other civilized country of the world. However, the greatest Socialist minds of Europe have spent years on this question without succeeding. Kautsky has written a book of about five hundred pages; and it is the poorest book he has written. He came to no final conclusion. France has adopted a platform by which they guarantee small farmers possession of their lands under Socialism. This is wrong, of course. In the first place, that guarantee would not be worth anything, because the grandchildren would not be ruled by any such guarantee. Secondly, it is not Socialistic.

The great trouble is that Marx himself falls down on the question of agriculture. We have to admit it.

I used to go round and preach twenty-five years ago, telling them we would have capitalistic farming on a large scale, farm trusts, so to speak. There was a man by the name of Dalrymple had a 50,000 acre farm up in Dakota, and another man named Schenle had a 20,000 acre farm in Pennsylvania and I told them the small farmer was gone, and that we would soon have tremendous bonanza farms that would employ thousands and thousands of men. We figured that concentration would take place the

same way in agriculture that it does in the factory. That is where we were wrong. The introduction of farm machinery has brought about an entirely different condition..

DEL. SEIDEL: Exactly so.

DEL. BERGER: The introduction of machinery works entirely differently in the field of agriculture than it does in the field of industry.

It is this way, comrades: In the industry it has practically eliminated the small employer, practically put him out of existence and created the trust. Now, it seems that the introduction of the machine works differently in the field of agriculture. All that it has done there is to eliminate the farm worker. The farmer with his machines and his three or four farm hands can now do the work. It has eliminated, for a time at least, you might say, the possibility of a steadily growing class of hired laborers. I don't know the reason for it. I tried to study it out for myself this way—I don't know whether Simons will agree with me or not. In the first place, in the factory industry, by the new inventions the technique, the process of production, has been changed. The entire technique has been changed. The entire process has been changed in the large factories of the trusts. But the introduction of machinery on the farm, in agriculture, did not have that kind of result. I think that is one of the reasons. The other reason—and I don't know whether Simons will agree with me there or not—is this, comrades, that the advantage of the big capitalists in the big industries is that they can use their capital and employ it the year round and day and night, while in the farm industry the machine can only be employed during a few months of the year.

Furthermore, the farmers can get together co-operatively on thrashing machines, for cheese factories and creameries. They run as many as sixty cheese factories co-operatively in one county of Wisconsin. I don't know whether my explanation holds good, but that is the way I tried to explain it to myself. At any rate, I don't preach any more that we are going to have big bonanza farms. The Dalrymple farm went to pieces; the Schenle farm was cut up; we don't really know what the result will be. Simons and I don't exactly agree, and Morgan and I surely don't agree. (Great laughter.)

I don't know what the result will be, whether it will be intensive farming or what kind of farming will be brought

about. Kropotkin, a great philosopher in his way, although an Anarchist, claims that intensive farming with the help of electricity will be the farming of the future and that three acres will be enough for each farm. Of course, that would bring about individualism. If that is to be the case we may have individualism some day in place of Socialism. However, one thing is sure, there is no use in attempting to break eggs that have not been laid yet. We cannot have Socialism in this country, if we don't get the farmers in some way. If you try to take away the farms of twelve millions of farmers of this country you will have a big job on your hands. You might as well try to reach down the moon. Even Tommy Morgan could not do it.

DEL. MORGAN: Put me on that committee and I'll fix it.

DEL. BERGER: If you were put on that job you would not last long. You remember how much effort and how many men it cost England to conquer thirty thousand farmers, Boers—Boers, mind you—and now try to take the farms from these twelve million American farmers and you will have about a million times harder job. Besides, they don't need to fight. All they have to do is to stop bringing food to Chicago for six weeks and Comrade Morgan and the rest of Chicago would be knocked out.

DEL. MORGAN: That is the only way you can knock me out.

DEL. BERGER: We must have some kind of a farmers' programme. It has been said that the proposition of the committee guarantees the farmer's possession of his land. I have looked this over carefully and Morgan is mistaken. It does not. But we must have some sort of programme and I am willing this shall be postponed until the question is understood; that we appoint a committee, and refer the farmers' question to that committee. I would like to be on that committee if I could. This interests me intensely. Let us study the question, as long as we are not ready to decide. I am in favor of referring this to a committee.

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.): I am in favor of referring this back to the committee, enlarging the committee, and giving them time to study it. This is a proposition that above everything else needs study and education. There was a time when I didn't know anything about the question at all. I thought I knew all about it. I knew absolutely and positively and certainly that unless we got that little

farmer's farm away from him we never could have Socialism. We had to take it or the great big capitalist would swallow it, and in a few years there would be just a few big farms in this country. We would grab them all and then we would have the co-operative commonwealth. But after a while I began to study the question a little more deeply. I studied a long while on it. I think I can say truthfully that I read pretty nearly everything that was printed in French, German or English on this question, and at the end of that time I produced "The American Farmer." In Europe at least two editions of twenty-five thousand copies of that work were issued. It was translated into nearly every European language. Yet in that book, as I studied more and more, I got less and less certain, and in it I made a good many more positive statements than I would be willing to make to-day. This programme has been called ridiculous. I can admit it, for it is not mine. It is practically the same in most respects as that adopted at the late French congress and adopted and advocated by such famous Socialists as Jules Guesde, the foremost Marxian in the European movement to-day. It was a good enough programme for Paul La Fargue, the son-in-law of Karl Marx. But in that programme they guaranteed the peasant ownership of his farm. I will not stand for that. Instead of guaranteeing that, we say something entirely different. I am astonished that a shrewd keen lawyer accustomed to reading things carefully, should say that we had guaranteed or proposed to guarantee the private ownership of land.

DEL. MORGAN: That is only what you say now. It is what you say there. I don't care for what you say now.

DEL. SIMONS: That is not what we asked you to consider.

DEL. MORGAN: I am looking for facts.

DEL. SIMONS: You will get facts. The German Socialists began to take up this thing. In the first place they were just as cocksure, and just as ignorant, on the subject as many of those who have spoken here to-day. Then Kautsky began to study this thing; a whole lot of German Socialists began to study this thing; they began to find out that they did not know all about it; they began to find out that a door was opened here that was wider than they ever dreamed of. They began to find out that here was a problem more complex, more intricate, than the industrial problem—more difficult

of analysis. But all of them—Bebel, Liebknecht, Kautsky—and surely they are men who know nearly as much about Marxian philosophy as Delegates Lewis and Morgan—almost as much, but not, of course, quite as much—but every one of them practically stands on these same principles. I can get you the quotations from Comrade Kautsky, if you wish. But no great Socialist to-day seriously proposes to take the small farmer's farm away from him. He does not propose to do so because it cannot be done. It does not make any difference what you say; what resolutions you pass; it can't be done. Look into this thing. Don't say to the farmer: "We will fix it up later." Shakespeare says somewhere: "I can call spirits from the vasty deep" and the reply is: "So, marry, can I; but will they come?"

We may pass farmers' programmes; we may say that we will drive him off his farm; but up to this time we have not got him really interested. We have done nothing but shout and make a loud noise, in our conventions, and that he does not even hear. It is time we studied this thing. It is time we knew something about it. It is time that in our state and national conventions we did something besides shout empty phrases. It is time we got some real knowledge on this subject. It is not enough to read a few pamphlets published in this country by men who try to translate Marx and don't know anything about it. We want a knowledge of Socialism that is a little bit deeper, a little more consistent with the actual facts.

Comrade Lewis, of Oregon, said that we were toadying to this and toadying to that. There is just one thing on earth that I will toady to and that is a fact. And when I meet a fact so big as the farmer question in America, a fact that has in it the future of twelve millions of people of the producing classes, without whom we stand no more chance of a Socialist victory in this country than we do of changing the orbit of the comet, when I face a fact as big as that, I don't try to stand in front of it and howl empty phrases, in the hope that that fact will get out of the way.

So I ask you to send this back. Fire me from the committee if you wish. I will keep studying anyhow. I will keep on working, because between me and the liberty I seek, between me and the co-operative commonwealth, between the working men of America and their dominion over this country, there stands

the farmers' question, and until we solve that question we might almost as well give up trying to get the thing we want.

DEL. UNTERMANN (Calif.): We discussed the immigration problem and some of the comrades gave us soap box speeches as a solution. We studied the woman problem and some of the comrades gave us soap box speeches on that question. They told us this was a class struggle; that we were working for the working class; that we were fighting for the working class; as though these delegates selected to represent the Socialists of the country have to be told the A, B, C of Socialism. Now we are discussing the farmers' question and some of the comrades are giving us soap box speeches again.

Now, I want it understood that I am in full accord with Comrade Simons on this question. I want it understood also, that on the great fundamentals of this question, Comrade Kautsky is also in accord with us.

Karl Marx, in his third volume on "Capital," assumed that centralization in the farming industry would take exactly the same course that it had taken and was taking in other industries; but he merely assumed that; he never investigated that. He never investigated the tendencies of agriculture in England, or in Germany, and much less in America, and when the question finally came up for discussion in Germany after long years of an impossible attitude on the part of the most advanced Marxians, Kautsky found that the Socialist position was this: The Socialist party demanded only the expropriation of the appropriators of the tools of production and distribution which were used to exploit the producers. But he found there was never anywhere in the Socialist movement any demand for the expropriation of the users of the tools, who use the tools to live. So far back as the Communist Manifesto you find that position. Kautsky now says that there is no proof that the great proprietors are gobbling up the small farms, or that the small farm is in every way industrially inferior to the great capitalist farm. He says that the reason that the small farm is maintaining its own against the great farm is not so much because it is economically superior, but because the small farmer by exploiting his wife and his son and daughter can compete with the great capitalist, who has to pay regular wages to his farm laborers.

So long as it is admitted that the small farm will have the advantage perhaps for

a hundred years to come, the only sensible position that the Socialist Party can take is the position taken by Comrade Simons in this report.

DEL. O'HARE (Kans.): As a woman born and reared on a farm, and working during most of the years that I have spent in the Socialist movement as an agitator among the farm workers, I wish to make one simple statement on this question, and that is to reiterate the statement of Comrades Simons and Thompson that this is a fact that simply must be met. Now, I don't mind dodging an issue as long as it can be dodged gracefully, but the time has come in this movement when this farmers' question can not longer be dodged. Either the Socialist agitator has got to leave the farm regions of the west and southwest alone, or that Socialist agitator has got to go to those intelligent farmers with some programme that they can understand. And I say to you that the men and women to whom I speak out there will average in intelligence fully as high as any audience ever gathered in the Garrick Theater in Chicago. I tell you, comrades, when you stand face to face with a great audience of seven thousand farmers, as I stood last fall at St. John, Kansas, and when they said: "Mrs. O'Hare, the Republican senator has talked to us on the land question; tell us the position of the Socialist Party," then there was no dodging for me. I had either to state the position of the Socialist Party on that matter or sneak out; but I didn't have anything to offer to those seven thousand farmers. I must work among the farmers because it is the farmer's psychology that I know. I don't try to go before any other group of people because I would be a fool if I did. I know my limitations. I can talk to people who were born on the Western ranches as I was, I can talk to those who have lived the life of a farmer's daughter, and a farmer's wife, and as I say, I want to work among them; and so I say, when I go back among them, give me something to talk on, something that I can take a stand on.

Next Sunday I have to stand before an audience in Kansas City, Kansas, and report to them on this congress. On the 26th, 27th, and 28th, I have to stand before meetings of farmers in Kansas. Now, I am perfectly willing to admit that there are a number of comrades here who do not know enough of this question to take a stand on this matter, but I say to you, if we have not yet taken any position on this farm question, for God's

sake let us find one. When I go to the wage workers, I don't go with a farmers' programme; but I must have one for the farmers. We do not say that this statement here is the last statement that we Socialists shall make on this question; but I do say that it is the best thing that we have yet had; and you fellows that know so much, if you will only get up and give us a better one, we shall all be under great obligations to you. You are just the chap I am looking for. If you haven't got anything better, vote for this. Must I go back to the farmers and say that we don't know and I don't know what we are talking about? I want something authoritative back of me.

So I say, keep the committee, increase it if you wish, go on studying, but, comrades, I don't want to wait two years to have the Socialists take some kind of a position. If we have not a position on this matter, let us find one. Let us find one quick.

DEL. AMERINGER: Comrade O'Hare, you have traveled all over the west and southwest, and I wish you would tell this congress something in regard to the farm labor question.

DEL. O'HARE: From my experience in those sections the farm labor question as a wage problem does not exist. The thing that was mentioned by Comrade Untermann is absolutely the condition in that country. The farmer exploits his wife and his son and daughter. I have seen a woman five hours before her child was born dragging a ten foot cotton sack—and I have seen that woman back there with her ten day old babe, and that is the kind of a farm labor problem we have in the southwest.

DEL. CANNON (Ore.): I want to introduce a few ideas that I think have not yet been presented. I am in favor of having no farm programme. You have the sense of this congress that we ought to have a farmers' programme, and I think we should therefore continue this committee. If that committee is continued and enlarged I want to say this: don't leave off of that committee the laboring man; the man who is tied down to one industry all his life is not necessarily the best judge of the condition in that industry. You have heard from the farmers; are they the ones best fitted necessarily to judge of this question? We should take their view; but we should also take the view of others; we should take a broad view of the question. All classes should be represented on that committee. We are talking of having a farmers' pro-

gramme; why not have a programme for the railroad employee?

DEL. BERGER: We have it.

DEL. CANNON: Why not make a special programme for every line of labor?

DEL. BERGER: We are trying to do that if we can work it out.

DEL. CANNON: Does not the farmer use machinery on the farm? My objection to the farmers' programme here is, that it favors individual ownership of a public utility. I am opposed to anything that will stand for the private ownership of any public utility. Land is a public utility. They have cited great authorities here. Which is best: to cite precedents and authorities, or to use reason as your guide?

A DELEGATE: Whose reason?

DEL. SEIDEL: May I ask what is your vocation?

DEL. CANNON: I was raised on a farm and lived on a farm for twenty-five years.

DEL. SEIDEL: What is your occupation at the present time?

DEL. CANNON: I lived on a farm for twenty-five years. Part of the time as an employer; part of the time as a wage worker.

DEL. SEIDEL: What are you doing now?

DEL. CANNON: Most of my time I have spent on a farm; now I am a lawyer.

DEL. SEIDEL: Are you a member of a farmers' association?

DEL. MERRICK: A point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Seidel will remain silent. Comrade Cannon has the floor.

DEL. SEIDEL: He dodged the question.

DEL. CANNON: I can answer his question, but I cannot answer a continuous fire of questions.

COM. HUNTER (Conn.): Comrades and Friends: We are here in this congress supposed to represent certain class interests of this country. We have sat here for four days; we have heard from the most learned men that we supposed we could pick out from our party on certain questions, and we have decided those questions, every one of them, in my opinion, unsatisfactorily. We have wasted a lot of time; we have mouthed a lot of phrases; but we have not gotten down to the facts. We have not considered the essentials of any question that we have yet met. We have not even discussed these questions as intelligent thinkers;

we have been passionate and emotional in all that we have said and done. I have stood here and watched this congress for several days and I am disappointed. Now, I am here to express my individual opinion. I want to say this: On all of these matters you have appointed men to study these questions, who are supposed to know something about them; you have appointed Ernest Untermann, known all over the world, a man whose name is familiar to Socialists everywhere, a man who has given his life to the study of these problems; you have appointed A. M. Simons, a man who has studied this farmers question from top to bottom, who has given every possible care and attention to it and who has written a book that is valued and appreciated in Europe, and that is not read by the members of the Socialist Party of America. You have appointed other men who have given deep and serious consideration to these problems. And then a man comes along who has read a few pamphlets and has learned a few phrases about economic determinism, and the class conflict, and he thinks he can settle all the problems of the earth with a few glittering phrases.

Now, this question has been discussed by every Socialist convention in the world; some of the greatest thinkers in our movement have written programmes on this subject; how many of you have read those programmes? How many of you have read the three programmes of the German party on this question? How many have seen the Belgian programme on that question? How many have seen those of France and Italy? How many of the comrades here are prepared to discuss this farmers' question? And yet we must have the co-operation of the farmers, if we are to accomplish anything for the working classes; if we are ever to bring about the triumph of Socialism. We have got to have with us the thousands of men who are just as miserable on their farms as the poor exploited sweeter of the East side. We have got to stand together. You see him in this struggle; you see him fighting the landlord; you see him fighting the man with the mortgage; you see him fighting the usurer; and you say you believe in the materialistic conception of history. Is that your answer to his cry? You say you believe in the materialistic conception of history. He says: What is that? That is economic determinism. What is that? he asks. And that is how far we have got. Now, great heavens, men and women of this congress, there is a chance

in this country to do something; to do something for the exploited and miserable of our land, on the farms as well as in the factories. If you want to vote down this report, vote it down. Recommit it. I don't care. But I do say that you are under an obligation to the proletariat of this country to do something. You have got to give thought and consideration to this question, and do everything that lies in you to solve this problem for those who are in poverty and misery and distress and are fighting to the death against the landlord and the capitalist.

DEL. BREWER (Kans.): Comrade Hunter admits that after we have selected some of the brainiest men in the Socialist movement to study this question they admit that they don't know much about it; and so in preference to settling the thing they have been studying they take a document from the State of Oklahoma and ask us to endorse it. I am in favor of recommitting this subject to the committee and let them investigate it further.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I have two suggestions to make to the comrade here. Please go out and find what the world of Socialism has said on this farmers' question. There is one book that will tell you a lot about it and about the world of socialism, "Modern Socialism," an authoritative text book; and it is evident there are a lot of you who have not read it, by the way you talk. The other thought I have is this: We had a convention two years ago and I am not going to forget in a long time the discussion on this question, led by Stanley Clark. We took him and showed him one fact after another, from the party platforms, and he weakened little by little and finally he made a motion that Thompson and I were willing to accept, but those who had been with him previously said: No, no. And they voted us down. They laughed at us then and they said, "Look at your vote," and I laughed back and said: "Yes, but you watch that vote grow." And it grew and grew and finally resulted in a referendum that stated our position exactly.

I want you to do two things: Study the literature of International Socialism; and then read what the members of the party said in their referendum. Here is what was adopted by the referendum: "There can be no absolute private title in land." That is true to-day. But we have to tell some folks about it. "All titles, whether called fee simple or otherwise, must be subordinate to the public title." That is true now; but we have to

tell some people. But they object to the use of land in any form for the purposes of speculation or exploitation. That is what the comrades said, the comrades who pay their dues to the party. That is what they agreed to. And they demand the possession, control and management of the land to whatever extent may be necessary to attain that end. What end? To prevent exploitation and speculation, and so forth. It is not opposed to occupation; it is not opposed to possession. Get that? That is fundamental to this whole discussion. They are not opposed to the occupation or possession of the land by those using it in a useful and bona fide manner without exploitation.

Now, that goes to the root of this whole matter. If you agree with that, you stand with the rank and file of the party membership, at least the majority of that rank and file in the United States, as evidenced by the referendum. If you don't agree with it you better go home and get your instructions.

DEL. ATWOOD (S. D.): I am a farmer, a hayseed. I will give you some facts. I lived on a claim in South Dakota. I sold it and blew the money in. I was worse off owning the farm than I was without it, teaching school in the summer.

The Dakota farmer takes this position: He wants the full product of his labor. He believes that he did not make the land; that it was there when he came. It will be there when he is gone. By his work he is making from thirty to fifty cents a day, and he wants the full product of his labor. He does not care what you do with the ownership of the land; it is the full product of his labor that he is

after. This whole discussion or most of it would be described by some of our farmers as a lot of hog wash. If you adopt that programme we will have to explain it to the farmers. I guess I will have to vote for it, but it is not very much. We studied two philosophers out on the plains; one is Peter Finley Dunne and the other is Karl Marx. Peter Finley Dunne says: "Workers of the wurld, unite; yez have nothin' to lose but yer brains; and yez never had any." When we hear Tom Lewis, of Oregon, we think of that. (Laughter.) We also read Karl Marx and we believe in Karl Marx; we believe that the farms are being concentrated in the hands of the landlords, and that those farms are being let out to the men who work them. The landlord is the enemy of the worker on the farms. And the farmers and the farm laborers don't care what you do so long as you secure to him the full product of his labor. Do you get that?

The previous question being moved and seconded, was declared carried.

Delegate Lewis moved that the matter be referred back to the committee, the committee to be enlarged to nine members and to report at the next national convention of the party.

The motion was carried.

The following nominations were then made for the six new members of the Committee on Farmers' Programme:

Delegates Wright, Maurer, Laukki, Ameringer, O'Hare, De Bell, Atwood, Untermann, Hunter, Carpenter, Adel, Freeman, Crider.

Adjourned until May 20, 1910 at 9:30 A. M.

SIXTH DAY'S SESSION.

Secretary Roewer called the congress to order at 9:30 A. M.

Del. Goebel, of New Jersey, was elected Chairman for the day.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first order of business, as I understand, is the election of the committee on the farmers' question.

Del. Strelbel: Before we go to that, I move to take up the matter of the adoption of the minutes of last Wednesday.

Certain corrections in the minutes were noted, and the minutes were then adopted.

FARMERS' COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next order of business is the election of the Committee on Agricultural Programme, six to be elected, as I understand.

On motion of Del. Killingbeck, it was decided to elect by ballot.

The name of Del. Davis, of Oklahoma, was added to the list of nominees.

The following delegates accepted: Wright (Nebr.), Maurer (Pa.), Leo Laukki (Minn.), Ameringer (Okla.), O'Hare (Kas.), Atwood (S. D.), Hunter (Conn.), Carpenter (Calif.), Freeman (Ala.), Cryder (Tex.).

The following nominees declined: Berger (in favor of Thompson), Untermann, Adel, Davis.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will now proceed to a vote. You are to elect six new members on this committee in addition to those already on. There are six new ones, are there not?

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): The minutes show that Lewis, of Illinois, made the following motion: That the report of this committee be sent back to the committee for further consideration and for a further and more complete report at the next convention, and that the committee be increased to nine.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right, that settles it. You vote for six. The tellers will now get ready to collect the ballots.

NEW CASTLE SITUATION.

DEL. KENNEDY (Pa.): I ask for five minutes to read a telegram that I have

prepared and that I want this Congress to stand for. There was a strong resolution introduced by the Resolution Committee in regard to the persecution of the Free Press in New Castle. That resolution will be buried in the proceedings of the convention, and I want a resolution adopted before the Free Press goes to press to-day. I want this Congress to stand for this telegram. There is nothing in it that you cannot stand for: "The National Congress of the Socialist Party pledges you the moral and financial support of the party in the persecution now being waged against the Free Press." Comrades, the Socialist press of the United States is not alive to what is going on in New Castle. You have heard about revolutionary action instead of phrases. In New Castle, there is revolutionary action. Six comrades are in jail for 90 days. Six more are under the same charge and are out on bond. Five more have been charged with criminal and seditious libel and will be brought to trial in June, and if convicted will be sentenced to the penitentiary for six years. One more is charged with criminal conspiracy and blackmail, and if convicted will be sent to jail for six years. I propose sending this telegram for the moral effect it will have in New Castle, so that the enemies of the Free Press will take warning that the Socialist Party of the United States is backing the New Castle comrades. A resolution like this should have been endorsed long ago, only for the fact that the persecuted comrades are obscure working men who are not known outside of Lawrence county, Pa. When this telegram goes forward it will, in a couple hours, be put up in their window. The paper goes to press to-day. This is the first case of criminal and seditious libel in the United States for 107 years, and I hope the Socialist Party will take some action to-day that will make it the last case for another 107 years. Not only every Socialist, but every lover of liberty and every defender of free speech and free press can stand for this.

Del. Hoogerhyde, of Michigan, moved

that the telegram be sent. (Motion seconded.)

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): You understand, I have a libel suit on, myself, at this moment, so I am not going to object. I want one thing understood by this party congress, and that is that everything is as stated. I take your word for it absolutely, and if it is not as stated you will never hear the last of it. There is one thing we must do in our party. We must be absolutely straight and above suspicion or the shadow of suspicion. I am not speaking of the Free Press, understand. I have a libel suit at this moment for \$50,000, and I stand with the New Castle comrades, only I hope everything is absolutely straight. There are some ugly charges made there against some of our comrades—hold-up charges. I hope that there is absolutely nothing to it, because, just imagine if there be the least thing crooked there, and this congress going on record for it, where would we be? Comrade Kennedy, I take your word for it, absolutely, that everything is absolutely straight.

DEL. KENNEDY: All the comrades from Pennsylvania will stand by it. Comrade McKeever has been accused of blackmail. When the steel workers went on strike Comrade McKeever went to the engineers, and although the strike had nothing to do with the engineers, he organized a sympathetic strike, and when the foreman discharged them, McKeever pulled the whistle and closed down the works, and they had to send detectives to Connecticut to get engineers to carry on the work.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

The tellers then retired to count the vote on the election of the farmers' committee.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next order of business is the report of the Committee on Constitution, Comrade Gaylord, chairman, Comrade Bloor, secretary.

DEL. GAYLORD, reporting for the Committee on Constitution: Comrade Chairman and Comrades, to save time and to insure a more complete understanding, the committee has had prepared in parallel columns the constitution as it now stands, which is in the left-hand column, and the proposed amendments in the right-hand column. If you will look at the left-hand column you will see that

occasionally words, phrases, paragraphs or sections are printed in black-faced type. These are those which the majority of the committee recommend, and generally unanimously recommend, to be stricken out.

The first change submitted by the committee was Section 3 of Article II, as follows:

"Sec. 3. A member who desires to transfer his membership from the party in one state to the party in another state may do so upon the presentation of his card showing him to be in good standing at the time of asking for such transfer. The secretary of the local to which he transfers shall notify the secretary of the local from which he transfers."

DEL. GAYLORD: Now, Comrades, I think it in order, if there be no objection, to pass each point without discussion, or even a motion.

DEL. WHITE (Mass.): I move to adopt the recommendation of the committee. (Seconded.)

DEL. CANNON (Ariz.): I notice it says a member in good standing may be transferred. Suppose I were visiting for two, four or six months, and in the meantime I have paid no dues, and then go into a new club, before I am transferred, shall I pay my back dues to the club if this is adopted?

THE CHAIRMAN: Let the Chair first state the method of procedure as to adoption, unless there is objection to it. We will have each item read, and if there is no objection I will then declare that article adopted as read, without any formal motion, just to save a motion. The Chairman of the committee will answer Comrade Cannon's question.

DEL. GAYLORD: As I understand the question, it is this: If a man leaves his local and is absent three or four months and has not paid his dues and wishes to join another, then can he pay his back dues and receive a transfer card? Is that your question?

DEL. CANNON: Yes.

DEL. GAYLORD: The answer, it seems to me, is plain. If the old local is willing to accept his dues and give him a transfer card, nobody else can have anything to say about it.

DEL. CANNON: Then I understand that the dues would go to the former local instead of the one to which he was transferred?

DEL. GAYLORD: Yes. Otherwise you would not be in good standing to get a transfer card.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no ob-

jection the section will stand approved as read. I hear no objection, and it is so ordered.

The next section of the report was read, as follows:

"Amend Sec. 5, Art. II, by striking out the words 'propertied classes' in line 8, and substitute 'capitalist class.'"

It was moved and seconded that the section be adopted.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I am opposed to that change. It opens the door wide for an alliance of the Socialist Party with the municipal ownership party or any political organization of men of property. Ours has been distinctly a wage class, non-propertied movement. The fundamental purpose of the organization has been to abolish private property as a means of exploiting the masses of the people and to establish common property.

DEL. GAYLORD: Will you permit me just a word? I can save some time for you. You will be very glad of the time I save.

DEL. MORGAN: I have been told that many times, that if I will shut up somebody will say what I have to say better than I can and in a shorter time. I am able to take care of myself. The propertied class is distinguished by the ownership of property, but the members may be the same as the working class, the wage class. Who is going to distinguish the capitalist class in a capitalist political organization? Who is going to define it? The lines are clearly drawn. There has been a distinct purpose upon the part of the master class and the educated class to bury the real meaning of the words that the working class understand. I have called your attention before in this congress to that fact, but I want to present that here again, that there has been three positive civilized systems establishing the relationship between human beings. The first was slavery; you understand what that is?

DEL. KILLINGBECK: We don't want a lecture.

DEL. MORGAN: The next was serfdom; you understand what that is? The present relationship is that of master and servant. That is a legal term; that is a positive term; that is what the workers understand. When you tell the worker he is a wage slave he understands it. You tell him he is a servant, and he understands it. You tell him his interests are opposed to the propertied class, and he understands it. But when you call him exploited, that is something different. It

does not carry distinction with it. It is confused in his understanding. Now, we have put in there the "propertied classes," the haves, as against the have-nots, the people who have nothing to lose but their chains, and you are getting rid of all the fundamental expressions. You call them sentimental phrases and all that, and you introduce these phrases from the political economists of the capitalist class. How are you going to distinguish? I own some property.

A DELEGATE: Aha!

DEL. MORGAN: Yes, you can understand that. You can understand that, and if I join with the municipal ownership party, mind you, you can understand that that party is opposed to the wage workers, to this party. But if you cut out that word and put in "capitalist," am I a capitalist? Who is going to say? I have got a home, and you will have to hunt up my record and inquire into my business before you know. My wife has got some property, and according to the law I understand the wife and husband are one; there is where I come in. But don't forget, there is a tendency here to ridicule me. There is a tendency to treat me with some degree of contempt. There is a laugh that goes around when I refer to my membership. I want to press into your minds that I have been a wage worker 38 years, and if I have managed to get something for my old age it is to my credit that I can stand on both my feet now and not care a damn for any capitalist, but am a propertied person that stands with the worker. I am in his party and I am going to fight for it as long as I have breath, and I am going to oppose every effort that is made by our intellectuals and politicians in the party to eliminate the meaning of words in our platform, and I oppose this.

Question was put on the adoption of the amendment and it was declared carried. A division was called for.

DEL. MORGAN: I ask for a roll call on that vote.

The roll call was opposed as being out of order.

The Chairman held that any member had a right to demand a roll call.

Del. Simons appealed from the decision of the Chair, on the ground that the roll call was not demanded by a sufficient number of delegates. Other delegates having called for a roll call, Del. Simons withdrew his objection, and a roll call was then ordered.

DEL. BREWER (Kans.): We are unable to vote intelligently. I cannot see

why they should desire to change that from "propertied classes?"

THE CHAIRMAN: This is not the time for debate. We will now vote. If you favor putting the word "capitalist" in place of the word "propertied," you will vote Yes. If you do not favor putting "capitalist" in place of "propertied," you will vote No as your names are called.

The roll was then called, the vote resulting in 58 in favor, 30 against, 20 absent or not voting.

Alabama—Yes: C. G. Hutchisson.

Arizona—No: Jos. D. Cannon.

Arkansas—Absent: Stanley J. C. Clark.

California—Yes: W. Carpenter, J. Stitt Wilson, Ernest Untermann, John H. Wilde. Absent: J. B. Osborne.

Colorado—Yes: W. P. Collins, Mila T. Maynard.

Connecticut—Yes: Ella Reeve Bloor, Jasper McLevy.

Florida—Yes: C. C. Allen.

Idaho—No: T. J. Coonrod.

Illinois—No: May Wood-Simons, T. J. Morgan, A. W. Nelson. Yes: G. A. Peterson, A. M. Simons. Absent: G. T. Fraenckel, Robert Giese. Absent or not voting: A. M. Lewis.

Indiana—No: Oneal, S. M. Reynolds.

Iowa—Yes: John M. Work, J. J. Jacobsen.

Kansas—Yes: Caroline A. Lowe. No: Geo. D. Brewer, Kate Richards O'Hare.

Kentucky—Yes: Walter Lanfersiek.

Louisiana—Yes: J. W. Barnes.

Maine—Absent: Grace V. Silver.

Maryland—Absent: W. M. Coleman.

Massachusetts—Yes: James A. De Bell, James F. Carey, Geo. E. Roewer, Jr., Dan. A. White. No: Harriet D'Orsay. Absent: Marion Craig Wentworth.

Michigan—No: Frank Aaltonen, J. Hoogerhyde. Absent: Henry Kummerfeld.

Minnesota—Yes: Morris Kaplan, Leo. Laukki, Mrs. Esther Laukki, J. E. Nash.

Missouri—No: W. W. McAllister.

Absent: E. T. Behrens, W. L. Garver.

Montana—No: Geo. W. McDermott.

Nebraska—Yes: Clyde J. Wright.

Nevada—Yes: W. H. Burton.

New Hampshire—No: John P. Burke.

New Jersey—Yes: Max Fackert, Geo. H. Goebel, Frank Hubschmitt, W. B. Killingbeck.

New Mexico—Yes: C. B. Lane.

New York—Yes: Jos. Wanhope, Algeron Lee, W. W. Passage, C. L. Furman, Dills, Gustav Strebel. No: Frank Cassidy. Absent: Morris Hillquit.

North Dakota—Absent: Arthur Bassett.

Ohio—Yes: E. E. Adel, Miller, D. P.

Farrell. No: L. A. Zitt. Absent or not voting: Marguerite Prevey, John G. Willert.

Oklahoma—Yes: Oscar Ameringer, Winnie E. Branstetter. No: J. T. Cumbie, G. W. Davis.

Oregon—Yes: E. L. Cannon. No: Tom. J. Lewis.

Pennsylvania—Yes: Jos. E. Cohen, Thos. F. Kennedy, Robert B. Ringler. No: Fred H. Merrick, Edward Moore, Jas. H. Maurer, Adams.

Rhode Island—Yes: Fred Hurst.

South Dakota—Yes: E. Francis Atwood.

Tennessee—Yes: T. H. Haines.

Texas—Yes: Dan C. Crider. No: W. J. Bell. Absent or not voting: P. G. Zimmerman.

Utah—Absent or not voting: W. Thurston Brown.

Washington—No: Mrs. E. D. Cory, W. H. Waynick.

West Virginia—Absent or not voting: Harold W. Houston.

Wisconsin—Yes: Victor L. Berger, W. R. Gaylord, Emil Seidel, Carl D. Thompson.

Wyoming—No: W. L. O'Neill. Absent or not voting: John Heckala.

Delaware—No: J. Frank Smith.

Georgia—Yes: Paul Hochscheid.

Mississippi—Absent or not voting: S. W. Rose.

North Carolina—No: Rufus J. Morton.

South Carolina—Yes: A. J. Royal.

Virginia—Yes: E. B. Statton.

Summary: Yeas, 58; nays, 30; absent or not voting, 20.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is adopted. We will now proceed to the next section.

DEL. GAYLORD: A new section is proposed to be added to Art. II, to be numbered Sec. 7. Sec. 7, as printed in the right column, is the report of the majority of the committee. In this case, however, the chairman is of the minority on that point, and I will ask Comrade DeBell to report for the majority.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.) read the proposed new section, as follows:

"Sec. 7. No member of the party shall be suspended or expelled without charges and opportunity to be heard, and every member expelled by a local of the party shall have the right to appeal from the decision of expulsion to the membership of the state, and as the final resort, to the National Executive Committee."

DEL. DE BELL: The feeling of the Committee was, after this amendment was offered, that there should be some

provisions made, so that the national organization would know who was and who was not suspended. I believe there have been some suspensions in states that were not justified, and they wanted to bring it up a little higher, so they took it up to the Executive Committee to make it final if they wished to go that far.

DEL. KILLINGBECK: I move to adopt that section. (Seconded.)

DEL. GAYLORD: I wish to present the report of the minority, which I think is in order. Comrades, the minority of the committee realize that there should be no unfairness in expulsion of members of the party. We realize that there might be possibly such unfairness within state organizations. But we do not wish to make seven elderly or young people the judges of the membership lists of the various states, who happen to be on the National Executive Committee. Accordingly, we present this section:

"No member of the party shall be suspended or expelled without written charges and an opportunity to be heard before his local or branch."

The meaning of that will be this: If John Jones is a member of the party in Illinois and is expelled without written charges, his case can be appealed to the national membership, not to the National Executive Committee. There is no provision for the appeal, but to have such facts brought to the attention of the national organization. There is no provision made for that. There are reasons for not making any provision. If the sense of justice in the party membership of the various locals of the state is not sufficient to demand a referendum on the question or an investigation, the case won't amount to much. So the question of the party membership within a state is still left to the local membership of that state unless the membership at-large is persuaded through the usual channels of publicity that the case is sufficiently serious to warrant interference with that which is one of the fundamental principles of our national organization, namely, the control by the state organizations of their own organization.

DEL. SIMONS: I am not in accord with either the minority or the majority, and I would move you to add these words right at the end of the section: "and as a final resort, to the National Executive Committee, provided such appeal is supported by locals or members at large including at least 25 per cent of the membership of the state from which the appeal comes."

Several delegates here have suggested to me that I put my percentage too high. Perhaps that is true. I won't squabble over that. I am going to put that at 10 instead of 25 per cent.

A DELEGATE: Five?

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.): No, 5 per cent is too small. I would rather make it 20 per cent. I think the minority report does not mean anything. There is nothing to keep any person that feels aggrieved, if he can arouse sentiment enough to get a referendum, from doing so. There never has been anything to prevent it. But I object to the proposal that any individual member throughout the country can appeal directly to the National Executive Committee, which would mean that your National Executive Committee would sit 365 days a year, 24 hours a day, and do nothing else but pass on appeals of members. They might be bona fide and might not be bona fide; it would be an utterly unfair body to pass upon them, because the person making the appeal would not be able to bring witnesses there. They could not get at the facts, and it would be absolutely impossible to get an appeal unless you developed an entire system of jurisprudence like you have in the Supreme Court, providing that briefs must be submitted and the National Committee must be judges only of the law and not of fact. Such a system is utterly improper and utterly unworkable in practice in such an organization as we have. There should be no appeal of any individual unless he can get at least 10 per cent of the membership of the state to back him up. If he cannot get 10 per cent, then he is certainly not entitled to the work of 40,000 members. Ten per cent of 3,000 members in a state would be 300, and 10 per cent of 4,000 would be 400. If he cannot get 400 members in his state he is certainly not entitled to demand that the time of 40,000 members be taken up with the appeal. I want to tell you what this would mean, even with the provision as to the National Executive Committee left there. In the last year the Committee has passed on appeals from Texas, Missouri, Montana, Oregon, California, and I do not know how many more states. My own opinion is, that we have made the situation very much worse in Montana, and in the other cases it would have been much better if we had had no appeal.

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): I would like to ask a question of information as to the meaning of the amendment. I will read it again to get it clear: "Provided such appeal is supported by locals or members

at large including at least 10 per cent of the membership of the state from which the appeal comes." It says if supported by locals having 10 per cent of the membership of the state, the locals supporting. If 60 per cent of the members are in the locals supporting the appeal and 40 per cent are against, you would have only 10 per cent of the 60 per cent of the members.

DEL. SIMONS: I see your correction, and I think I will strike out the word "locals," if there is no objection to it. I will ask that the word "local" be stricken out. Now let me read it as changed: "Providing such appeal is supported by at least 10 per cent of the membership of the state from which the appeal comes."

THE CHAIRMAN: Read the entire thing as you wish it to stand.

DEL. SIMONS: (Quoting) "No member of the party shall be suspended or expelled without charges and opportunity to be heard, and every member expelled by a local of the party shall have the right to appeal from the decision of expulsion to the membership of the state, and as a final resort, to the National Executive Committee, provided such appeal is supported by at least 10 per cent of the membership of the state from which the appeal comes."

A DELEGATE: What do you do about written charges?

DEL. SIMONS: I don't think I have anything to do with that.

DEL. MOORE (Pa.): Is this proposed as a substitute for the majority?

DEL. SIMONS: I propose to offer this whole thing as a substitute.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is a substitute for both the minority and majority reports. That is the proposition before the house.

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I would like to know in regard to the question of the per cent. It says 10 per cent of the membership of the state. Does that mean the membership, or only 10 per cent of the vote as voted?

DEL. SIMONS: The membership that has voted.

DEL. FURMAN: Suppose the majority of the members don't vote, then what is going to happen? You don't get the vote of the membership, for the membership don't vote.

DEL. SIMONS: I mean this. In order to have an appeal he must get the signatures of at least 10 per cent of the members according to the last reported membership as determined for other

voting purposes by the national office, by dues paying.

DEL. GAYLORD: That is only for the initiative.

DEL. WORK (Ia.): I am opposed to the adoption of the section even with the addition made by Del. Simons, because the local or branch to which the member belongs knows better than anybody whether that member ought to be expelled or not. The National Executive Committee necessarily cannot know anything in particular about it unless witnesses are brought to Chicago and appear before them. They cannot intelligently pass upon such a question. And in addition to that, the National Executive Committee ought not to have any such power whatsoever. It is not in accordance with our principles to give any such power to a body of seven men. I would not want that power if I were on the committee myself, and I do not think any other seven men in the Socialist Party ought to have the power as the final resort to pass upon the membership of the members of this party.

DEL. CANNON (Ariz.): I favor the majority report of the committee. I am not so much afraid of the power of the National Executive Committee as Comrade Work appears to be. We know that there are times when locals in different localities become aroused over certain questions that come up before them, and we also are aware of the fact that the majority is not always right, although for the time being we are willing to abide by the decision of that majority. Now, at a time of great stress or excitement, if one of our members takes a firm stand for what he thinks is right, but he is a hopeless minority in that local, they have the power and they may carry out what the majority thinks is right, but I believe that the member standing for what he thinks is right, whether he is right or not, should have the power of appeal to something else besides the local. What we want to do is to give the membership a feeling that, no matter what they advocate, when they think it is right, that in the end they are going to have justice, and have a final hearing from a body far removed from what may be the local prejudices of the case. Charges have been brought against the National Executive Committee on almost every action they have taken, and I myself am far from being satisfied with much that the National Executive Committee has done. But, when it comes to a question of my membership in the Socialist Party, on a matter of principle and

right, if the locality from which I came decides that I am wrong and puts me out of the party, I want to appeal to that National Executive Committee and have that point settled. I want the right to go over the heads of the local membership to get my standing in the party. Comrade Simons comes with an amendment that provides for a request from 10 per cent of the membership of the state. I want you to look over the various referendums that you have adopted and see what per cent of the entire membership of the party voted. Some of these referendums have got as high as 10 per cent, and those have been referendums upon which the most intense interest was displayed. Those have been referendums which have been of vital importance to the party and its machinery, and when you stop to think that you have only got 20 per cent of the membership on any of those referendums, how is it possible for any obscure member in obscure localities to get 10 per cent of the membership in order that he might have an appeal? I have only taken this suggestion up in order to show the importance of building up the Socialist Party. What we want to do is to build a big, magnificent organization. I want to place no barrier in the way of the membership getting into the organization and staying in it. I want the membership to have full confidence in the integrity of the party, local, state and national, and when they have got an idea or principle that they want to fight for, I want them to feel that they can go out and fight for that idea or principle with absolute confidence, that ultimately they are going to have a fair and final hearing, and have justice accorded to them. Comrade Gaylord, for the minority report of the Committee, tells us that he does not favor giving the Executive Committee this power; he does not favor giving them this power in the constitution, but he says they can do it any way. If he is willing to let them do it any way, why not put it down in black and white in the constitution, so that they know how to do it and how to proceed? As far as I am locally concerned, this clause, I think, will interfere very little with our work, because as yet, as far as I know, we have expelled but one member from the organization, and we have not even spoken of expelling any more. But, whether it is good for Arizona or Maine or Massachusetts or Washington or Florida, I do not know. I want them to have an opportunity to meet cases as they arise and authority to deal with them,

and the only way you can do it, is by adopting the majority report of this committee.

DEL. COHEN (Pa.): I want to state the situation. All those who are in favor of having the National Executive Committee constitute a Supreme Court will vote in favor of the majority report here as amended. Those who are opposed to it will vote in favor of the minority report.

DEL. M'ALLISTER (Mo.): In every debate that we have had in this hall, I have sat and listened. I have seen exhibited a spirit amounting almost to personal abuse. Now, in Missouri, we find a great big howl; in Texas I hear of it; in Oklahoma I hear of it; against the action of the Executive Committee. Now, I want to tell you that my visit to Chicago has proven to me many things that I did not know of. Our Executive Committee, my friends, is wrongly accused in a great many instances, and I find in the majority of instances and I find in the majority of instances. As regards this article that we are talking about, I have but one objection to it, and that is that final resort. I cannot see how you ever got it in there. We Socialists stand first, last and all the time against the arbitrary decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States where it has decided all these questions against labor in its fights against the capitalist class. My friends, I raise a warning voice to you in this congress. Never allow any man or set of men in the Socialist organization to have the power to finally decide anything. It is fatal to the aims of the Socialist Party of this country to lodge such supreme power with any set of men. I believe we ought to vote that down. (Applause.)

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): You all know that I have been a member of several Socialist parties before this came into existence, and the split always came and the troubles always came because we took up a certain matter nationally and there was a cleavage all the way from ocean to ocean, simply because somebody could not agree with somebody. There were factional matters; they were appealed to the Supreme Court; there was dissatisfaction with the decisions of the supreme court; we had democracy gone to seed, and the thing went to pieces. That is the reason why I insisted upon state autonomy when this party was formed. Now, I have not invented many things in my life for which I can ask a patent, but this is one of my patents, the principle of state autonomy. You remember that

it was fought bitterly, especially by the East, at the unity convention at Indianapolis, and I may say that though Comrade Simons and Comrade Morgan did not agree with me on the question of programme, Tommy not so much as Simons, but they did agree with me on the question of state autonomy. That is what has split the party in Washington, and split the party in California, Missouri and Nebraska. They fired certain locals, and when it came up to the National Executive Board, all we could do was to offer our good services. Comrades, I do not want to be on the National Executive Board if I have to act as a member of a supreme court. (Applause.) There is not enough of the czar in me. I do not want to be a czar, and least of all a supreme court czar. I have held them back every time they have tried to interfere. I surely did not like the imperialists of Washington. I disliked them. I knew they were a bad bunch in every respect, and I knew that they were not straight and they did not act straight, and they proved their own crookedness to us. However, I stood in favor of deciding that we could not interfere at any time and every time I stood by the constitution. Now, I do not want you to go back on that principle of state autonomy. All you have to do and all that is necessary for the Executive Board to do, is to go into a state and make it possible for the membership of that state to decide for itself. That is all we want. That is all that is necessary in order to make the organization more effective, and I am sorry that my friend and good Comrade Gaylord did not find a way of doing that. We ought to find a way that the National Executive Board, upon complaint of a certain number of members, should have the power to go into that state and call a referendum of the party membership of that state to decide its own affairs.

DEL. THOMPSON: They have it.

DEL. BERGER: They have not at the present time. The per cent is too high. You should make it possible that a reasonable percentage of them should have the right.

DEL. THOMPSON: That is covered in the second paragraph of Section 9, Article XII.

DEL. BERGER: I know this article, but that is not sufficient, because under that very proposition a handful of members could keep out several hundred good Socialists, as was done in the State of Washington, where they kicked them out, and then, having kicked them out, those

in power would not let them have anything to say. A little bunch could keep out a whole lot of good, honest members of the party. Now, we ought to change that. So I say again, do not adopt the majority report as proposed, because I for one do not want to act as a member of a supreme court.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have no printed rules at hand here. Is there any objection from the floor to the Chair limiting the speeches to five minutes?

DELEGATES: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. From now on I will call time at the end of five minutes, unless there is objection.

DEL. ADEL (Ohio): A point of information. I want to call your attention to Section 4 of Article XII of the Constitution, which says: "In states and territories in which there is one central organization affiliated with the party, the state or territorial organization shall have the sole jurisdiction of the members residing within their respective territories." To get over that you must have the consent of the respective state or territorial organizations. Ten per cent is not the consent of the organizations that you are asking for.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see that that is a question of information?

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): The report of the majority committee or majority report, if you please, would lead us into the building up of a judicial system in the Socialist Party. It would mean that we would have a reproduction eventually of all the various courts that the capitalist system has to-day, if we carry it to the logical conclusion. I maintain that the Socialist Party, if you adopt the majority report, would render itself unable to cope with the issues of its own organization. I claim that any attempt on the part of any state or any other division except the smallest division of the party, the local, and any attempt by any other part of the organization to act as a court, would have the same effect as if we were to accept the majority report and create a supreme court. The Supreme Court of the Socialist Party, if there should be such a thing, should certainly not be the National Executive Committee. The National Executive Committee has something more to do besides settling the quarrels of you and me in our individual capacity. This would be to defeat the entire proposition, which should be something along the line of making the local itself responsible for its own action. I am not going to have the

National Executive Committee, or even a State Executive Committee, in local matters control my destiny, for the simple reason, that if the local itself is not able to cope with its own committees, its own members, how is the State going to do it? What do you know about little local and personal differences? I know that in Chicago, which is as large a local as you have anywhere in the United States, we certainly have a series of continuous grievances and appeals, etc., but we were always able to settle our own difficulties. You have never yet seen an appeal from the Chicago organization to a higher court. We were always able to settle them. I assure you, comrades, we have our difficulties here as much as any where, but we are always able to settle them with our own Committee on Grievances and not appeal, and if there is any local in the Socialist Party of the United States that cannot settle its own affairs, especially grievances and appeal, it ought to go out of existence, because that local ought not to be recognized as a part of the Socialist Party. Now, I trust the congress will vote this proposition, the majority report, down. I am absolutely against the majority report for the reason that it would make more trouble than it would do away with, in the long run, and for that reason I am going to vote against it.

DEL. MAURER (Pa.): This is a question that has agitated the minds of the comrades in Pennsylvania for some time. I happen to have been a member of the State Executive Committee for several years, and my experience may be of some use in this case. We have had cases in Pennsylvania where a lot of branches were expelled and where individuals were expelled, and they invariably appealed to the State Committee. Now, we in those cases found it very difficult to find out just what the trouble was, and I can fancy what would happen on the National Executive Committee if they tried to do the way that we found we were unable to do as a State Executive Committee. We had a case in Steelton, where there was trouble with the branch. It took nearly a year for the State Committee to get at the truth. Both parties concerned, the local and the branch, gave contradictory reports of their grievances, and so on, and finally the State Executive Committee was compelled to send a man on the ground to make an investigation, and the upshot of it was that even the State Executive Committee did not see fit to act on any of these charges and

referred them to the convention, and we found that not one thing was ever brought on the floor of any State convention. Now, I favor this part of the amendment to the majority report which calls for ten per cent of the party membership to give their consent, because, if that were the rule, it would not permit some little cross road local to bring some small matter before the attention of 40,000 members of our party. They could not get the ten per cent, and for that reason I favor it. But I do oppose the idea of letting the thing go to the National Executive Committee. I think it should be left entirely to the State to settle their grievances, and if the injured party can get ten per cent of the members to agree that he should carry his case forward to the party membership, all right, but if not, I think the state ought to settle it, and if the state cannot, then he should be privileged to extend it to the party membership. I do not believe we would get such a case to the party membership.

The previous question was then moved and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is now on the substitute as offered by Comrade Simons for both the minority and majority. Comrade Simons' motion is the report of the majority of the committee with certain words added as to the ten per cent. Under the rules, as I understand it, both the minority and majority have a right to speak in closing. They have a right under the rules to fifteen minutes, but I am going to ask them both to take no longer than five or seven minutes at the most.

DEL. DE BELL: I want to speak, and two minutes is all I want.

DEL. GAYLORD: The proposition of the minority is very simple, and the simplicity of it has been brought out. If it is not necessary to reaffirm state autonomy, well, then, don't reaffirm it. But do not constitute seven elderly gentlemen or young people, some of whom may be women comrades, a Supreme Court to force back upon the state organization a man who may have come into a town unknown for the purpose of making trouble, and then, when he is fired, compel them to take him back. (Applause.) That is possible. Do you get it, now?

DEL. WHITE (Mass.): Not very probable, though.

DEL. GAYLORD: It has been not impossible under such conditions as existed for the last few years down in Wisconsin for crooked fellows calling themselves

Social Democrats, but ex-Republican politicians, to get in before we understood them. The state is the proper unit of organization. It is big enough to carry out its policies and has wisdom enough. If the state is not right on the question of Socialism and organization it will go to pieces. Comrade Berger, the organization will go down. Then they will come under another provision that is now in the constitution, which provides that when the membership falls below a certain number it can be declared unorganized. Then you can go to work again and build it up. When they are wrong they go to pieces, don't they? When they are right they will grow. But when they are right and growing you have no business to interfere in their state organization. Suppose a man has got in for the purpose of being a trouble maker in their organization. They ought to have the right to decide whether they will keep him or not. Now, some people are good people, as people. But they are like a grain of sand in a watch. When a grain of sand gets in a watch the only thing to do is to put it out. It is good sand, as sand, but it is a poor part of a watch.

A DELEGATE: It is in the wrong place.

DEL. GAYLORD: It is in the wrong place. It is good sand, but it won't do in a watch. An organization, made up of those who are to work together, should have the privilege of working together, and they cannot do it when you force somebody back in there that don't want to work together. Do you get it now? That is the problem of organization. We are to put together a machine that works, that works, that works, and doesn't have friction and heat. And you will have friction and heat if you allow that one particle in there that is not actually a part of the organization. You have got to hold these organizations together with the spirit of Socialism, and when they lack the spirit of Socialism they don't work, and when they have that spirit they go on with the work of the Socialist Party. But give the state unit freedom. It is big enough. Keep the hands of the nation off. I remember a man who got into our party in Wisconsin. We fired him, and since that time we know that he is a Pinkerton. He was a trouble maker in the organization. He could talk Socialism, all the phrases and holy words, and some that were unholy. But we found him out and we fired him. He was not a part of the works, understand. Afterward we discovered what he was. Now,

he might have taken his case to the National Executive Committee, and they, not knowing the man, not knowing the situation, not understanding the spirit of our organization, might have forced him back on us, where he would continue the work of disruption, and then we would have been in nice shape by this time. No, no, no.

DEL. DE BELL: I think it has been fairly demonstrated by the minority report that Wisconsin's interpretation of state autonomy is state tyranny. It puts a man out and doesn't give him a chance after you put him out.

DEL. GAYLORD: We don't do anything of that kind.

DEL. DE BELL: That is practically what you said right there. I can hear and understand English. But they would go farther than that. I want to say that the interpretation is different in different places. State autonomy is all right for some people. It does for certain conditions, but I don't want a municipality to dictate the destiny of the organization.

DEL. BERGER: State autonomy came up twelve years ago.

DEL. DE BELL: He talks about the Supreme Court. There is not a local, there is not a state, that doesn't select a committee, usually of five, to try all cases. You cannot deny that, and there is not a case that I know of where charges have been preferred against any member of the party—charges that were charges, charges of any importance—but what while it was pending upon that committee they were suspended. There is a possibility in different locals that some people might be illegally dealt with. If the Executive Committee is to have the supreme authority that you say it is, why don't you move that the right to appeal shall extend to the membership of the United States? But when you tell me that state autonomy implies the absolute control of the membership and that the state shall say whether they shall be in the Socialist movement or not, I will not accept that state autonomy. I stand for a National Socialist Party to determine the merits or demerits of the individual, and not the state. Now, there is the difference between our interpretations of state autonomy. I want the power lodged somewhere to determine who is and who is not a Socialist. There are some people in this congress who, if they got into some of those states, would not be Socialists because they would not stand in with certain people; they would not accept certain conditions that are exist-

ent. As a consequence of that they would be put out; not because they are not Socialists, but because, if you please, they would not stand for a certain rule. I say that without any apologies. I hope, if you haven't made up your minds to support Comrade Simons' amendment or substitute for the whole, that you will vote this whole thing down, because I think this expression of the intent of the committee would not be fair to the individual. I hope you will leave it as it is now. The time is coming when you are going to deal with this. That is all I have to say on it.

The substitute offered by Del. Simons was as follows:

"Art. II, Sec. 7: No member of the party shall be suspended or expelled without written charges and opportunity to be heard, and every member expelled by a local of the party shall have the right to appeal from the decision of expulsion to the membership of the state, and as a final resort to the National Executive Committee, provided said appeal is supported by at least ten per cent of the membership of the state from which the appeal comes."

The substitute was defeated by a vote of 52 to 38.

The report of the tellers on the vote for the Committee on Farmers' Programme showed the following elected to the committee: Delegates O'Hare, Hunter, Wright, Ameringer, Freeman, Maurer, in addition to the three members of the existing committee.

ROLL CALL.

Vote was then taken on the minority report as follows:

Alabama—No: C. G. Hutchisson.
 Arizona—No: Jos. D. Cannon.
 Arkansas—Absent or not voting: Stanley J. C. Clark.
 California—No: W. Carpenter, J. Stitt Wilson, Ernest Untermann, John H. Wilde. Absent or not voting: J. B. Osborne.
 Colorado—No: W. P. Collins, Mila T. Maynard.
 Connecticut—Yes: Ella Reeves Bloor, Jasper McLevy.
 Florida—Yes: C. C. Allen.
 Idaho—Yes: T. J. Coonrod.
 Illinois—No: G. T. Fraenckel, T. J. Morgan, A. W. Nelson, G. A. Peterson, A. M. Simons. Absent or not voting: Robert Giese, A. M. Lewis.
 Indiana—No: S. M. Reynolds. Absent or not voting: O'Neil.

Iowa—Yes: John M. Work. No: J. J. Jacobsen.

Kansas—No: Geo. D. Brewer, Caroline A. Lowe, Kate Richards O'Hare.

Kentucky—Yes: Walter Lanfersiek.

Louisiana—No: J. W. Barnes.

Maine—No: Grace V. Silver.

Maryland—Absent or not voting: W. M. Coleman.

Masachusetts—No: James A. De Bell, James F. Carey, Harriet D'Orsay, Geo. E. Roewer, Jr., Dan A. White. Absent or not voting: Marion Craig Wentworth.

Michigan—No: Frank Aaltonen, J. Hoogerhyde. Absent or not voting: Henry Kummerfeld.

Minnesota—No: Morris Kaplan, Leo Laukki, Mrs. Esther Laukki. Yes: J. E. Nash.

Missouri—No: W. W. McAllister. Absent or not voting: E. T. Behrens, W. L. Garver.

Montana—Yes: Geo. W. McDermott.

Nebraska—No: Clyde J. Wright.

Nevada—No: W. H. Burton.

New Hampshire—Yes: John P. Burke.

New Jersey—Yes: Max Fackert, Geo. H. Goebel, Frank Hubschmitt. No: W. B. Killingbeck.

New Mexico—No: C. B. Lane.

New York—Yes: Algernon Lee. No: Jos. Wanhope, W. W. Passage, C. L. Furman, Park Dills, Gustave Strebel, Frank Cassidy. Absent or not voting: Morris Hillquit, H. Schefer.

North Dakota—Absent or not voting: Arthur Bassett.

Ohio—No: E. E. Adel, D. P. Farrell, Marguerite Prevey, L. A. Zitt. Yes: Miller, John G. Willert.

Oklahoma—Yes: Oscar Ameringer, Winnie E. Branstetter, J. T. Cumbie. No: G. W. Davis.

Oregon—Yes: E. L. Cannon, Tom J. Lewis.

Pennsylvania—Yes: Jos. E. Cohen, Fred H. Merrick, Thos. F. Kennedy, Edward Moore, Jas. H. Maurer, Robert B. Ringer, Adams.

Rhode Island—Yes: Fred Hurst.

South Dakota—Yes: E. Francis Atwood.

Tennessee—No: T. H. Haines.

Texas—No: W. J. Bell, W. W. Buchanan, P. G. Zimmerman.

Utah—Absent or not voting: W. Thurston Brown.

Washington—Yes: Mrs. E. D. Cory, No: W. H. Waynick.

West Virginia—Absent or not voting: Harold W. Houston.

Wisconsin—No: Victor L. Berger. Yes:

W. R. Gaylord, Emil Seidel, Carl D. Thompson.

Wyoming—Yes: W. L. O'Neil. Absent or not voting: John Heckala.

Delaware—Yes: J. Frank Smith.

Georgia—Absent or not voting: Paul Hochscheid.

Mississippi—Absent or not voting: S. W. Rose.

North Carolina—Yes: Rufus J. Morton.

South Carolina—Yes: A. J. Royal.

Virginia—Absent or not voting: E. B. Slatton.

The minority report was defeated by a vote of 53 to 37, 18 absent or not voting.

The majority report was then adopted as follows:

"Art. II, Sec. 7. No member of the party shall be suspended or expelled without written charges and opportunity to be heard, and every member expelled by a local of the party shall have the right to appeal from the decision of expulsion to the membership of the state, and as the final resort to the National Executive Committee."

The report of the committee on Article III, Section 1, was then adopted, after the words, "national congresses," had been added on the suggestion of Chairman Gaylord.

On motion of Chairman Gaylord, the proposed Section 4 of Article VI, as reported by the committee and slightly modified, was adopted as follows:

"Art. VI, Sec. 4. The National Executive Committee shall transmit copies of the minutes of its meetings to all members of the National Committee. Such minutes shall also be published in the Monthly Bulletin. Any act of the National Executive Committee, unless called in question by a member of the National Committee within fifteen days after notice of such act has been mailed by the National Office to the members of the National Committee, shall be in force."

Article VII, Sec. 3, as reported by the committee, was adopted as follows:

"Art. VII, Sec. 3. The National Secretary shall issue to all party organizations Monthly Bulletins which contain all important official reports and announcements; a report of the financial affairs of the party; a summary of the conditions and the membership of the several states and territorial organizations; the principal business transacted by the National officials and such other matters pertaining to the organization of the party as may be of general interest to the membership. No personal correspondence shall be published.

"The Bulletin shall be largely given to accounts of the more important organization and propaganda work of the national, state, territorial and local organizations and to the work, discussion and explanation of new and effective methods of organization, education and propaganda."

Article VII, Sec. 4, was then adopted as follows:

"Sec. 4. The National Secretary shall be empowered to secure such help as may be necessary for the proper transaction of the business of the National Office. Such employees may be discharged by the National Secretary, the National Executive Committee, or the National Committee."

Article VII, Sec. 5, was then adopted as follows:

"Sec. 5. The National Secretary and the National Executive Committee may be recalled by the party membership."

Article VII, Sec. 6, was then adopted as follows:

"Sec. 6. The National Secretary may be temporarily recalled by the National Executive Committee pending a referendum to the party membership which shall be immediately initiated by the National Executive Committee."

Article VII, Sec. 7, was adopted as follows:

"Sec. 7. Any members or member of the National Executive Committee may be temporarily recalled by a majority of the National Committee pending a referendum to the party membership which shall be immediately initiated by the National Committee."

DEL. GAYLORD: It is moved to strike out Sec. 2 as it appears in the black faced type, and adopt instead of that the section on the opposite side as follows:

"Sec. 2. The Lecture Bureau shall have the right to make arrangements for special lectures under its auspices with all state organizations of the party, Chautauquas or other organizations, charging such lecturers a commission for services rendered in arranging such tours."

The old Section 3 of Article VIII was stricken out and the new section reported by the committee was adopted as follows:

"Sec. 3. The National Committee shall establish a uniform rate of compensation for all lecturers and organizers working for wages under its auspices."

The new Section 4 of the same Article was then adopted, as follows:

"Sec. 4. Bulletins, statements and reports shall distinguish between organizing tours and lecture tours."

Chairman Gaylord then read the pro-

posed new Section 5, as follows:

"Reports of results obtained by organizers shall state the number of members secured and the number of locals organized."

DEL. BERGER: I do not believe that this would be a just procedure so far as the organizers are concerned. It encourages humbug on the part of the organizers. In one part of the country there may be a big strike on and the organizer may easily organize a big local, many of whom may drop out after the trouble is over. Another organizer may work harder in a different field and organize a local of fighting members that will do a lot of work. I do not know that I have a substitute just at this moment, but why do we have this at all? I move that this section be stricken out.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): There ought to be some way of finding out what our organizers are doing. Heretofore we have never been able to find out anything except a short statement in the monthly bulletin. We do not know whether their work is really effective or not. Paper is patient and you can print anything you want on paper; it won't kick. I think the membership should know whether there is any result from that work or not.

DEL. MOORE (Pa.): I agree with Comrade Berger, that this will encourage humbug. We have trouble down in Pennsylvania and there an organizer can go and do a lot of work and make a splendid report. I am not in favor of leading people into temptation. We don't want cooked reports; we want raw material. We have a very good way now of judging to some degree of the work being done; the state organizations can tell pretty well by the amount of dues being paid in. We don't want to encourage organizers to go out for the purpose of getting good reports instead of getting good membership material.

THE CHAIRMAN: Every national organizer has a blank furnished by the National Office with a space for every day, and he makes an exact report of how much he spends and how he spends it; what locals he organizes; and all that sort of thing, and the number of members; you are doing all those things now.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): If Comrade Goebel had divulged this information, he would probably have changed the opinion of the committee. He did not give this kind of information when this was drawn and every member knows he did not. He was one of the organizers who claimed

that other people were getting credit for the work he was doing.

There can be nothing lost by the adoption of this, and if anyone makes a false report you can easily get at it. There is nothing lost and a great deal to be gained.

On a division the motion to strike out the proposed section of the report was declared carried by a vote of 33 ayes and 28 noes.

Chairman Gaylord then read and moved the adoption of Article X, Sec. 6, which he read as follows:

"Article X, Sec. 6. Railroad fare of the delegates going to and coming from conventions and the congresses of the party and \$3.00 per day shall be paid to the elected delegates of all states, territories and foreign language speaking delegates.

"The National Secretary shall have printed and distributed to all states, territories and unorganized states and foreign language speaking sections uniform special assessment stamps at 25 cents each, to be purchased by members, and all members must buy at least one special stamp within four months after issue to be in good standing.

"All funds from special stamps sold by State Locals or Foreign Language Branches shall be turned over to the National Secretary, and in the event of the assessment failing to meet the expenses of the delegates, the difference shall be paid out of the general fund."

Del. Kaplan moved to lay the section as read on the table; which motion was defeated.

DEL. LEE: As chairman of the Resolutions Committee I have received a letter which should have gone to the Constitution Committee. It relates to a technical change. The local at Honolulu thinks we should say "transportation" instead of "railroad fare" as they may wish to send a delegate to this convention and it might be found to be difficult to reach this country from Honolulu by rail.

DEL. GAYLORD: The committee will accept the change.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I believe that the delegates to this convention should be paid. It is an outrage to expect delegates elected to these conventions to come here and pay their own railroad fare and their own hotel bills. At the present time we all pay our own expenses. We are here selected by the party membership to represent them and yet we are expected to pay our own hotel bills. I believe we are expected to do as good work as the men who are organizing, and we ought

to get as much money as those that are out organizing.

A DELEGATE: Can't you have the states provide for the expenses, outside of the transportation?

DEL. BERGER: You can make it any way so that we get as much as an organizer; we ought to get as much as that anyway. Our state pays organizers twenty-eight dollars a week and expenses. Now, I don't want you to pay as much as our state pays the state organizers. I had to borrow some money to-day from the City Clerk of Milwaukee—

A DELEGATE: City money?

DEL. COHEN: I hope this will carry, because as the sessions of the conventions are prolonged, the poorer delegates often have to go home before the convention is over because they can't afford to remain longer.

DEL. BERGER: Yes; Hunter and Spargo have already gone.

DEL. COHEN (Pa.): I don't believe this should be left to the states. This is a national convention and the national party should pay the expenses.

DEL. BELL (Tex.): I don't think it was quite fair to put these two provisions in one paragraph.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to divide the section.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection we will divide the section.

The motion to pay the transportation of all delegates to conventions and congresses of the party was declared carried.

The question as to whether the delegates should be paid three dollars per day during the convention was then declared by the chairman to be before the house.

DEL. LANFERSIEK (Ky.): This does not treat the delegates the same as the organizers, because the organizers are paid their expenses in addition.

DEL. MOORE (Pa.): At the beginning of these conventions the delegates were compelled to pay all their expenses, car fare, and lose their time, and all. The trouble with that was that only the states and individuals who could afford it sent their delegates, and we had conventions composed largely of little bourgeois business men. Now, the object was to get the proletariat here, and the next move was to get at least the railroad fare. Many of the delegates who came had collections taken up. Now it is proposed to pay three dollars a day. Let us go step by step and next convention we may find it is all right and go a step further and

agree to pay the expenses of delegates. Let us see how this works out. I think it should be adopted as printed here.

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.): I think we ought to do a little figuring on this. Transportation was paid in order to equalize the distance that comrades would have to come. Now, when it comes to paying expenses, each locality is equal on that. The expenses of the delegates from California and from Chicago are equal. The next convention, if we have 300 delegates at three dollars a day, that means nine hundred dollars, or nearly seven thousand dollars for a week's convention. Now, we are simply voting the impossible. Then it says it should come out of the general fund. That means that we might not be able to hold a convention. It seems to me it would be much better to urge upon the states that they pay all they can. Let us hold the transportation matter as it is now. We are undertaking something that we cannot carry out. No one would like to see it done more than I; although it would not affect me.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I come from a state that voted against this congress. If I go back to Allegheny with the record of having voted to pile up more expenses for another congress I shall hear from the people at home. While I concede that it is more democratic when you hold these congresses to pay these expenses, but it tends to encourage holding these congresses, and this one has already proved they are of very little use. But, if you believe in these things, be consistent and go to the limit and say that every cent of expense from the time the delegate leaves home shall be paid. But there is a growing opposition to these congresses among the rank and file of the country, and you are adding to it if you adopt this.

DEL. FACKERT (N. J.): I am opposed to this. It would make it too entirely comfortable for the delegates. And if we collect from our states we shall have to show good reasons for the collection. There are some states now that pay the expenses of the delegates and I think that it should be left with the states. It gives the state some sort of hold on the delegates.

DEL. SCHNAIDT (Ohio): The delegates at such congresses as this are always ready to pile expenses on the rank and file and it is so at labor congresses. But when you take the cash out of their own pockets, then they are not ready to do it. I think the transportation is amply

sufficient and let the states deal with the expenses as they wish. The state of Ohio made up its expenses by a special assessment, or out of the party treasury. Two years from now, when the state of Ohio will have twenty-one delegates, if the state cannot afford to pay my expenses, I will pay my own. Another point; there are a number of men who are already in

the pay of the party; and under this clause they could collect twice. There are a lot here that would be entitled to double pay. Let us stop at the transportation; some of us are ahead even at that. There are men here who have their transportation. Let the transportation remain and let the states attend to the expenses.

Adjourned until 2 P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Chairman Goebel called the Congress to order at 2 o'clock P. M.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): To test the feeling of the delegates and to see if they want to hold a night session, I move you that we hold a meeting to-night, beginning at eight o'clock. (Seconded.)

DEL. WORK (Ia.): I move as a substitute that we hire this hall for to-morrow. (Seconded.)

The motion of Delegate Work was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: No night session to-night, and a session to-morrow; that is what it means.

REPORT ON CONSTITUTION.

Consideration of the report of the Committee on Constitution was resumed.

DEL. STREBEL: I move the previous question upon the article under discussion.

The motion was seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now proceed to a vote. The question will be divided in voting. The chairman of the committee will make the closing remarks, and then we will proceed to the vote.

DEL. GAYLORD: The question, as I understand it, on the first paragraph, or the question as divided, is whether or not the party is to pay the \$3 a day. That is the question, I believe, is it not?

THE CHAIRMAN: What we are going to vote on is the entire section as it stands, but we are going to vote first on the \$3 a day proposition, and then upon the assessment or voluntary proposition.

DEL. GAYLORD: That is the question as divided?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. GAYLORD: That is the way it will be. Now, I want to suggest that there is one thing perhaps that you will permit the committee to make clear, only for the sake of clearness; I do not want any debate at all. There would be some lack of clearness, and so it should be determined first whether or not the \$3 per day shall be for the time during

which the delegates are going and coming, or whether it should be simply for the time during which a convention is in session. On behalf of the committee I would suggest that we do not go too far if we insert "\$3 per day during the sessions of the convention." Is there any objection?

DEL. DE BELL: On the part of the committee I object to that.

DEL. GAYLORD: Very well.

After considerable more discussion and an appeal from a ruling of the Chair by Del. Bell (Tex.), the Chair being sustained, a vote was taken and resulted in the defeat of Section 6, of Article X, by a vote of 23 in favor and 29 against.

DEL. SIMONS: A point of information. I understand we have just now defeated the last section, and there is now left the original section?

DEL. GAYLORD: The original section stands.

The next section of the report, being new Section 8 of Article X, was read, as follows:

"Sec. 8. All national platforms, amendments of platforms, and resolutions, adopted by any National Convention or Congress, shall be submitted seriatim to a referendum vote of the membership. One-fourth of the regularly elected delegates to have alternative paragraphs submitted at the same time, such alternative paragraphs signed by one-fourth of such delegates shall be filed with the National Secretary not later than one day after the adjournment of the convention."

DEL. MERRICK: A point of information. Does that affect the amending of the constitution?

DEL. GAYLORD: Not adversely under present conditions, excepting it makes it possible for one-fourth of the regularly elected delegates to any convention or congress, by filing with the secretary at the national office a proposition, to have it submitted with the balance. It is a movement in the direction of democracy.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): It seems to me that it would be very good practice

to submit all alternative propositions for referendum so as to give the form as it stands originally and the proposed amendment. I think that ought always to go with the referendum so that they will have both before them, and I would not be in favor of this proposition making it necessary for one-fourth of the delegates to ask that they go out, but I would make a constitutional provision that it always go that way. I move to strike out that proposition and change it so that when platforms or constitutions are submitted, that both forms shall be submitted together seriatim.

DEL. GAYLORD: Do you mean motions proposed from the floor and everything else?

DEL. THOMPSON: Yes.

DEL. GAYLORD: Those adopted and those not?

DEL. THOMPSON: No, those that are agreed upon in the convention are sent out.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before the house is to adopt the article as read. Do I understand that Comrade Thompson amends?

DEL. THOMPSON: Yes, I want to amend it. (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. BERGER: There is only one difficulty about that thing. Sometimes there is a motion, an amendment, and an amendment to the amendment, and then a substitute to the amendment and substitute for the whole. Now, we would have to submit all three, four or five propositions in order to be fair, and this would make it so much harder for the membership to decide among four or five different theories put before them, and it is harder for them to vote intelligently. The referendum is a comparatively new thing in this country, and if you knew how difficult it is for the Socialist Party to legislate with the referendum you would not make it any harder than you have it. Make it as easy as possible. When we submit an amendment to the constitution in Wisconsin, and as far as I know in other states, we submit the original amendment, and then right next to it the proposed change. That would be satisfactory, but do not submit any more propositions or amendments, which would make it so much harder and mix them up.

DEL. KILLINGBECK: I move the adoption of that paragraph.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a motion. The motion is to adopt the paragraph as read, and Comrade Thompson

moves to amend. He is now writing it out and putting it in words.

DEL. SIMONS: I want to understand Comrade Berger. A great many times, those who have submitted an alternative motion or have submitted a substitute, before the thing finally comes to a vote have withdrawn it or changed their minds, and it is simply foolish to burden the membership with all these matters. We have already the possibility of invoking a vote of the entire membership as easily almost as to call the roll of yeas and nays on this floor, and it seems to me we ought not to make it as easy to call for a vote of 40,000 people as it is to ask for the yeas and nays here. There is no question but what there is never a motion that you could by any possibility submit that would not get at least one-fourth of the delegates present. It seems to me that is going to be confusing.

DEL. THOMPSON: A point of information. If you will let the Secretary read the amendment as I dictated it to him just now, it will clear the matter up.

The Secretary read: "Thompson, of Wisconsin, moves to amend Sec. 8 by striking out all that follows after the word 'membership' in the fifth line, beginning with the words 'one-fourth of the regularly elected delegates;' from there to the conclusion of that section he desires to have stricken out, and in its place to substitute the following: 'All recommendations agreed upon by the Congress shall be submitted to the referendum seriatim, both the original paragraphs and the alternative paragraphs thus agreed upon to be submitted to the referendum.'"

DEL. GAYLORD: A point of information. I want to ask Comrade Barnes whether it is the practice, in sending out national referendums, to submit the original constitution together with such new paragraphs as are proposed, and where in the convention it is proposed to adopt other paragraphs, whether all of these are submitted to the referendum at the same time.

SEC. BARNES: Following the convention of 1908, the old constitution and the amendments affecting the same, were printed in parallel columns, and I presume by an error or misunderstanding the National Secretary had instructions on the ballot that they could vote either for the old provision or the substitute provision. That was changed, so that they could only vote on the substitute provisions. Since then all ballots on amendments to the constitution have carried the old

section and the proposed amendment, but they only vote on the amendment.

DEL. SCHNAIDT (Ohio): If we adopt Comrade Thompson's amendment I do not see that there is any use in our voting on this question, because we are now deciding which will be the matters for the party membership to vote on. If we adopt his amendment, then everything that comes before these various committees should be inserted in the referendum, and there is no use in holding a convention.

DEL. THOMPSON: It means only what is finally decided.

DEL. GAYLORD: That is not what you say.

DEL. SCHNAIDT: That is exactly what we want to do, what we are finally deciding on, but with this amendment everything would go to the referendum. I am in favor of wiping that whole section out and simply vote that the congress is to decide which article is and which is not to be brought before the referendum of the party. That is what we are sent here for, and if we do not do that, we don't need to hold any convention, and everybody can submit their articles for consideration to the various committees and they will go in the referendum and we will vote on them, and we will have about fifteen or twenty different propositions. Now, we are here to decide what shall go before the party, and that only, and I think this section is superfluous.

DEL. KILLINGBECK: I move the previous question.

Motion seconded and carried.

DEL. GAYLORD: The chairman of the committee has a word to say in closing. I do not think it is quite clear, from what has been said. Comrade Thompson wishes to have all matters that are finally decided upon submitted in referendum form.

DEL. BERGER: He did not say that.

DEL. THOMPSON: That is what I say.

DEL. GAYLORD: That is the present practice, according to Secretary Barnes' report. What we wish is something more than that. What we wish is to say that if there are one-fourth of the delegates who are sufficiently in earnest about a matter and believe that the congress is wrong and that the matter should go to a referendum, they have the right to have that submitted to referendum, whether it has come before the convention or not, but you must file it within twenty-four hours of the adjournment of the congress. It is not at all improbable that it

might be a good thing, and I think it is a vast improvement upon the Thompson proposition, inasmuch as all that he proposes is to crystallize in formal action what is already the practice.

DEL. THOMPSON: If you leave it so as to put everything in, I will agree to that.

DEL. GAYLORD: It is not necessary. That is the practice now in submitting the constitution, anyhow.

The amendment was adopted, and the Article as amended was adopted.

The next section of the report was read, amending Section 1 of Article XI by substituting the word "forty" for "twenty" in line seven, and adding the following at the end of the section: "Provided, the necessary number of seconds shall have been received within 60 days of publication in the Bulletin. The vote on such referendum shall close fifty days from date of submission thereof," so as to make the section read as follows:

"Sec. 1. Motions to amend any part of this constitution, as well as any other motions or resolutions to be voted upon by the entire membership of the party, shall be submitted by the National Secretary to a referendum of the party membership, upon the request of forty local organizations, in five or more states or territories, or any smaller number of local organizations in three states having two thousand members in the aggregate; provided, the necessary number of seconds shall have been received within sixty days of publication in the Bulletin. The vote on such referendum shall close fifty days from date of submission thereof."

It was moved and seconded to adopt the section as amended.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): I move to amend so that the section shall read: "Motions to amend any part of this constitution, as well as any other motions or resolutions to be voted upon by the entire membership of the party, shall be submitted by the National Secretary to a referendum of the party membership upon the request of locals representing at least five per cent of the entire membership of the party on the basis of dues paid in the preceding year. The vote on every such referendum shall close fifty days from the date of its submission."

The amendment was seconded.

DEL. LEE: This involves two differences from the committee's report. We are, I believe, pretty generally agreed—and when I say we, I do not only mean the delegates here, but I believe that it can be truly said of the party membership generally; that we are pretty generally

agreed that the provision for referendums has been ridiculously lax, especially in view of the fact that the party membership and the number of locals have increased vastly from year to year. It was very low when we put it out two years ago. There has been a very great increase in membership in two years. There will probably be a still greater increase within the next two years.

With the present rapidly growing condition of the party and with the presidential campaign coming on within two years from now, we may expect a very greatly increased membership. Now, the committee proposes merely to double the number of locals required to initiate a referendum, making it forty instead of twenty. We have 3,200 locals at the present time, when we propose to allow forty to initiate a referendum. These 3,200 locals, in all probability, not in two years, but in one year, will have grown to at least 4,000. The provision which I move will considerably increase the number of locals that would probably be required, unless, indeed, most of those locals were decidedly large ones. It puts the thing, I believe, upon a much fairer basis. I think it is a very liberal provision when it provides that five per cent of the membership, based on the average during the preceding year, may initiate a referendum, and I do not think it is necessary to discriminate as to whether this number comes from within one or two or three states or more. It seems to me that the five per cent provision, which is one that will regulate the number of persons demanding it automatically along with the growth of the party, is a very simple proposition, and is by no means putting the limit too high. Personally I think it is too low, but it is by no means putting it too high; while the present provision, even with the different amendments, I believe, leaves it in such a position that the party can be tied up with referendum which can be acted on by but a small part of the party membership, and which may be carried, as some of them have been carried, to the great surprise of the party membership, and then reversed within a few months. I therefore move the adoption of the amendment.

DEL. KENNEDY (Pa.): Two locals in Pennsylvania can initiate a referendum, under the amendment, if that is incorporated.

DEL. SIMONS: As I understand, it will read that referendums shall be on the request of forty locals located in five or more states or territories, or any

smaller number of locals in three states embracing at least five per cent of the members.

DEL. LEE: It would be by locals representing five per cent of the membership and located in at least three states. That is what I mean.

DEL. SIMONS: That is what I meant to say.

DEL. LEE: The sense is perhaps the same.

DEL. SIMONS: Then you would cross out "or a smaller number of locals in three states?"

DEL. LEE: Yes.

DEL. SIMONS: Then the amendment would read: "At the request of organizations in five or more states or territories embracing five per cent of the membership?" Then you would have nothing to do except to get that number.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will read the substitute as proposed by Comrade Lee, so that we will know what we are doing.

THE SECRETARY: There have been so many suggestions made as to how this should be amended that I am not absolutely certain this is correct, but I believe it is: Comrade Lee moves to amend Article II, Section 1, to read as follows: "Motions to amend any part of this constitution, as well as any other motions or resolutions to be voted upon by the entire membership of the party, shall be submitted by the National Secretary to a referendum of the party membership upon the request of locals representing at least five per cent of the entire membership of the party and located in at least five states, on the basis of dues paid in the preceding year."

DEL. LEE: May I say that I did not intend in my motion to leave out that provision of the committee report, that the necessary number of seconds shall have been received within sixty days from the publication of the motion? That was my error. Otherwise that is perfectly correct.

The Secretary read the remainder of Delegate Lee's amendment, as follows: "The vote on every such referendum shall close fifty days from the date of its submission."

DEL. BERGER: As I understand the referendum, and as it is understood where it has been used, it is an appeal to the membership without any regard to locals or branches. That is how I understood it. I remember that five years ago the state of Wisconsin voted on a referendum put out on the motion of a little branch

in Crestline, Ohio, which, through the kindness of the National Secretary at that time, had the privilege of getting enough seconds, and if it had not been for the good sense of the membership at large, the referendum would have carried. I think we ought to block things of that kind, and I believe the referendum ought to be based upon the individual membership and not on the locals. As it is now, a little local of five members counts for as much as Local Chicago or Local New York or Philadelphia or Milwaukee. Now, that is ridiculously unjust. The entire membership ought to be the basis. Furthermore, we ought to be sure that the members asking for the referendum are members in good standing. We ought to demand that everybody signing the demand for a referendum for a city or state should be in good standing, to be attested by the local secretary. In other words, if twenty members of Local Chicago sign something, then their respective secretaries ought to attest that these twenty or fifty or one hundred members, as the case may be, are in good standing. We ought to make this a fundamental rule. As for the rest, I am perfectly willing to adopt it, except the substitute of Comrade Lee.

Delegate Killingbeck (N. J.) was called to the chair.

DEL. GOEBEL: If I were asked as to the particular part of the work of this congress that I am more interested in than anything else, it would be this matter that you have before you now. It is all right to talk about being flooded with referendums. Now let us sit down quietly for a moment and figure just how great has been the abuse that we hear so much about. I want to say this: we hear lots of talk about intellectuals and of the proletariat. We hear lots of talk about controlling things, running things. As far as I am concerned, I have not seen it. They talk about mistakes. I am willing to take every one of the referendums of this party, and after all, if you will, take the referendums that we have had, the worst of them, they have not proved such great mistakes. I would like to have some one stand on this floor and tell me one mistake—even though the mistake was made temporarily—I would like to have you tell me of one mistake that stood on the constitution books of this party for six months or a year. After they made a mistake they were very quick to find the mistake, and at the same time they had all the advantage of having the power in their hands. Now, the only

reason we have had any trouble from the referendum has been because there has been absolutely no limit upon the time during which seconds might be made to a proposed referendum. One referendum that I have in mind was left open for over eight months. We have had one other. By the time the eight months had gone by twenty seconds had been received for that referendum. If that referendum, when it went out, had stated as it does in the amendment proposed by your committee, it would have stated that the necessary seconds would be required within sixty days, and it would never have got to the membership at all. What is it that is proposed? Two thousand members. Now, five per cent of 40,000 means that 2,000 members shall be required before we shall have a referendum. The membership has not doubled, but we have doubled the number of seconds required, and they are required to have them within sixty days. Under the old way, how many referendums did you have? How many referendums have we had during the past year? Take the referendum on the election of officers and national committeemen, and I really think that if the referendum served no other useful purpose, if it had no additional reason, it was justified in that case. I claim that what we have proposed to-day is no more than to make the matter more definite. I claim that every time we send out a referendum upon the party officers or upon any provision of the constitution, to that extent we are educating the rank and file. Let us take the position made by your committee. It has doubled the number of seconds required, making it forty instead of twenty, keeping the control of the party in the hands of the membership, and yet avoiding unnecessary referendums.

Del Goebel resumed the chair.

DEL. COLLINS (Colo.): I do not want to see anything done that will make it harder for the membership to get a referendum if they want it. I want to see this movement stay in the hands of the rank and file. I would rather see party conventions wiped out. I would rather never have another one, than to see the referendum curtailed in the least. Will this amendment make it harder to deal with, harder for the little back country local to get a referendum of the party membership than it will under the one drawn by the committee? If it will, I am against the amendment. I am for making the referendum as democratic as possible.

DEL. RINGLER (Pa.): I want to call the attention of the delegates to the fact that the word "Local" represents different ideas in different portions of the country. Local Pittsburgh consists of 800 members, while a local in the back districts may consist of five members. The way this is worded to-day 200 persons might call a referendum of the party membership, because these 200 members might compose forty locals of five members apiece. I think the plan last suggested would be better, because it gives a more definite basis for basing the referendum upon. I also favor the idea that persons applying for a referendum should be certified to as being in good standing. As a state secretary, I know something about this. I am much interested in having something at least scientific or logical or democratic.

DEL. BELL (Tex.): There is only one question that I care to discuss. I do not see any objection to requiring certificates by the secretaries that the persons applying for the referendum are in good standing. That is all well and good. But don't be too hasty about placing a limited time, and don't give us sixty days; give us not less than ninety days. That might seem a long time to you, but I know it is not a long time to the people in the agricultural districts. There are many reasons that I could give you why we ought to make it not less than ninety days. If you can't do it in the ninety days, all right; but don't make it sixty days.

DEL. M'LEVY (Conn.): I am in favor of Lee's amendment, making it five per cent of the membership of the state instead of on the basis of the locals. But I believe with the comrade who just said that we should not place a short time limit on it. The time required for the seconds should be long, for this reason: After it is started it is a month before it appears in the party bulletin, and then, before the members that are going to sign this petition know what they are signing, they have got to discuss it in their locals, and a reasonable time should be allowed for the discussion of any proposed referendum that comes up. For that reason I believe we should make it ninety days instead of sixty.

DEL. GAYLORD: It will not be difficult at any time within ninety days to start a referendum on some question within the party organization, if you go after it. That is not what you want. All that is wanted is liberty to make changes that are necessary between conventions and congresses. We are not choking them

off. We have added additional leeway in the presentation of matters that come before the congress or do not come before the congress at the time the congress or convention meets. Sixty days is time enough, if there is anything necessary for the life of the party and for the activity of the party. Don't open the door too wide. There has been a good deal of resentment among the party membership at playing with the referendum in these last two years. There has, and you know it. We have tried to overcome that. Forty locals is enough; if you make that simply five per cent of the vote of the state it won't be very hard to get them through.

The question was then put on the adoption of the substitute and it was carried.

DEL. GAYLORD: It is proposed to strike out Section 2 because of the amendment of Section 1, and since in the substitute there has been included, as I understand it, that which was proposed by the committee in the amendment to Section 1, I think it will be all right to strike out Section 2 as it stands. The committee so recommends.

DEL. LEE: I so move.

The motion to strike out was seconded and carried.

DEL. GAYLORD: Section 10 of Article XII: It is proposed simply to strike out the words: "Who shall be selected as far as possible from the section in which the state is located." This is the story: When states are declared unorganized or are otherwise unorganized, the Executive Committee may appoint secretaries to reside there and their salaries may be paid. This, as it at present stands, says that they shall be selected, as far as possible, from the section where they are to do their work. If it is in California, select them as far as possible from the section where they are to do their work. It is simply confusing, and the Executive Committee will select the men anyhow.

The recommendation of the committee was concurred in and the words stricken out.

DEL. GAYLORD: Article XIII stands as it is. Article XIV, Section 1: It is proposed to strike out the section as it stands in the present constitution and substitute therefor the following:

"Sec. 1. Delegates to the International Socialist Congress shall be elected by referendum in the year in which the Congress is held. The call for nominations shall be made on the 1st day of January. The election shall be conducted in the

same manner as the election of the members of the National Executive Committee. There shall be one delegate for every 5,000 members, ascertained by computing the average membership for the preceding year. The next highest in the election shall be the alternates. The expense of the delegates, and a per diem equal to the per diem fixed for national organizers and lecturers, shall be paid out of the national treasury."

It was moved and seconded to substitute the section as reported for the section as it now stands.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I would like to ask for a little more explanation. The last sentence says that the expense of the delegates, and a per diem equal to the per diem fixed for national organizers and lecturers, shall be paid out of the national treasury. Now long a time does this usually cover?

DEL. GAYLORD: Delegates Simons or Delegate Berger can answer that question.

DEL. BERGER: There is an International Congress held, as a rule, every three years; every four, but as a rule every three.

DEL. MERRICK: I want to get at about what the total expense would be on that.

DEL. BERGER: The cost of the entire trip depends usually on the boat you take. You can take a ten-day boat or you can take an eight-day boat, and some steamers take a little longer. The first-rate boats are more expensive, but what you save one way you have to pay out another. You can make the trip in about four weeks nicely.

DEL. MERRICK: I move to amend so that the last sentence shall read: "The expense of delegates shall be paid out of the national treasury." (Seconded.)

The amendment was put to a vote and was lost.

DEL. DE BELL: I move to adopt the original recommendation. (Seconded.)

DEL. LEE: The word "expense" is an ambiguous word. Now, I take it that the committee meant to pay transportation and three dollars a day. Did they mean transportation and living expenses and three dollars a day? I would like to know about that.

DEL. SIMONS: That is what I want a ruling on. That is the reason I seconded the motion, because as it stands there, it is necessary to pay the international delegates, in addition to their transportation and hotel, the three dollars a day.

DEL. LEE: If it is in order I would

move to amend or substitute the words "Cost of transportation" for the word "Expense." Will the committee accept that?

DEL. GAYLORD: The committee did not so understand it and did not so intend. It was definitely threshed out in the committee to this effect: that we have understood that Comrade Hillquit could go and some one else could go because they could afford to spend the time. There are others whom we would like to have go who are working men, and we think they ought to have enough to support the babies, as some one has said, and the railroad fare and the hotel bill. If there is anything else involved in necessary expense, well, that must go too. If you have got to pay other things, they should be covered. That is why I asked Berger and Simons to explain.

DEL. SIMONS: There is one expense in traveling in Europe which it is well to remember—the tip. You cannot get around without it. I tried it once on the boat and I will never do it again. That is the difficulty in making this something definite, transportation expense and three dollars a day, or transportation, hotel and three dollars a day. If it is going to cover no more than transportation, don't put "Expense" in. I think my expenses were \$250.00 for six weeks.

DEL. GAYLORD: Did that include the tips?

DEL. SIMONS: It included tips and everything.

DEL. AMERINGER (Okla.): I would like to know whether the Socialist Party is an organization for the purpose of reducing wages? There is not a labor union in the United States that exploits its employees so bitterly as the Socialist Party. I have heard of the Brewery Workers' Union, big-footed Dutchmen, who make their living by hard work, and they paid their organizers three dollars a day and five dollars for expenses. Shall a national party of the United States be so measly as to demand that their international representatives stop in a shabby Gasthouse over in Europe? No; let us be a little bit businesslike. Is the Socialist Party of this country so poor as to be unable to pay its representatives to an international congress \$3 a day, when others pay \$5 and expenses and all transportation? If so, then for Heaven's sake let us go out of business.

DEL. MOORE (Pa.): I come from a district where we are endeavoring and succeeding in getting working men into the party. The average wages there in

that textile district do not amount to \$9 a week, and I want to call your attention to the fact that one of the reasons we are having such poor success in getting them in is, that we have been accused of being a lot of grafters. We have some of our old S. L. P. men who come along and point out, "what high salaries are being paid by this middle class Socialist party."

Now, if these men and women that I am talking about support their families on \$9 a week, and if I understand the Socialist movement, it is intended mainly for this kind of people, I believe that our representatives at the international congress can very well afford to go there and have their expenses paid. I am one of the people that stood by the cradle of the American Federation of Labor before there was a Brewery Workers' Union. I have seen the men who helped to build up that Brewery Workers' Union to the proud position it occupies now, sent to jail in the city of Philadelphia for distributing boycott notices, and there was not enough money that could be raised by the Brewery Workers who were organized, to secure counsel for them. These men went to jail, and when they came out of jail they were blacklisted. These are the men who built up that Brewery Workers' Union, and if this organization of ours is to capture the powers of government and succeed in emancipating labor, it is not going to be done by sending people on international tours and giving them a chance to pose as middle class people able to pay tips. I am making no reflections now on Comrade Simons. He says it is absolutely necessary on the other side, and the tips have got to be paid. Let us pay them when we send them over there, but do not let us lose sight of the fact that we have members getting only \$9 a week, who cannot afford it. Let us pay necessary expenses, but I am not in favor of making it an inducement for people to rob the Socialist Party.

DEL. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): When we elect international delegates we hope to elect men who are capable of representing the party, and then let us pay their wages and not forget that they have wives and children at home. When we send a representative, I think we should pay his expenses, his transportation, and his average wages, the same as our organizers have. If we want capable representatives in our international organization, then we must figure on the wives and babies those men have who are going to represent us.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): Do I understand Comrade Lee's motion as meaning to pay \$3 a day and pay the expense only?

DEL. GAYLORD: There is the transportation and expense, so that it will read, "Transportation of delegates and per diem," etc.

DEL. DE BELL: That includes \$3 a day?

DEL. GAYLORD: Whatever the per diem of national organizers may be.

DEL. DE BELL: I am in favor of that if it brings that out clearly. The reason I am in favor of it is this: As the matter stands at the present time, four weeks' average time to and from the sessions of the congress makes it so that the working man could not exist; that is all there is to that. If \$3, in the interpretation of our Pennsylvania comrade, means grafters, then I must say that his interpretation is a very poor one, and if the \$9 a week, which I know to be a fact, is the average wage in Pennsylvania, we have got to go and bring Pennsylvania up. We know it is the China of the United States on wages. In order to give a working man an opportunity of contesting as a delegate to the International Congress, some provision must be made for his family. His family cannot live on the generosity of the community. That is the mistake that I think our congress has made on other things, not paying the expenses, because they have made an inducement once before to take only those who can afford it, and depriving the proletarian from representation by denying the opportunity of an existence to his loved ones at home, needing support when he is away at a congress of this kind.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): How many delegates would we be entitled to on our present membership?

A DELEGATE: Eight.

DEL. MORGAN: Eight delegates, and pay all expenses, including tips? I would like to have that information before we vote.

DEL. SIMONS: The expense is about \$300 a person.

DEL. MORGAN: Didn't you say it cost \$250 for the expenses outside of vessel money?

DEL. SIMONS: No; that was everything, including vessel money.

The question was put on the amendment by Delegate Lee, striking out "Expense" and inserting "Cost of transportation." The amendment was lost by a vote of 26 in favor and 32 opposed.

On motion, the committee's report as read was adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: There is a misprint in the next article. The mistake is in presenting this in any form to be changed at all. It should stand, according to the recommendation of the Committee. Article XV should stand as it is. There is no question on that. Article XVI, it is proposed to change by striking out the provision as it stands and substituting that which appears in the right hand column:

"Sec. 1. This constitution, as revised by the Congress, shall take effect sixty days after being approved by a referendum of the party membership."

The article as proposed by the committee was adopted.

The next article submitted by the committee, numbered in the committee's report as XVI, was read as follows:

"ARTICLE XVI

"Woman's National Committee.

"Sec. 1. At the beginning of each odd numbered year a Woman's National Committee of seven members shall be elected from the women members of the party by referendum vote of the entire membership of the party, in a manner similar to the election of members of the National Executive Committee. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner.

"Sec. 2. Such committee shall have general charge of propaganda and organization among women. All plans of such committee, concurred in by the National Executive Committee, shall be carried out at the expense of the national office."

It was moved and seconded to adopt the article.

DEL. BLOOR (Conn.): It has just been called to my attention that, as it reads, the present committee would have to go out of office before they have had a chance to report to this congress that elected them, so I would like to see some change made in the wording of that, providing that they shall report to the next national convention.

DEL. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): I see what the comrade is speaking of, but I think we would accomplish that if we proposed to let the committee report to the membership. For two years we have been a standing committee. Three times I have appealed to the National Executive Committee for some system or some amendment to the constitution which would enable the membership to elect our committee, but it has been put off, because of the fact that we were to report to this congress. Now, we have reported, and

the congress has elected a new committee to investigate and report on this matter again. I am opposed to Comrade Bloor's amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Comrade Bloor simply misunderstands. As the Chair will rule, it will be that the Woman's Committee elected by this congress will stand as the Woman's Committee of the Socialist Party until such time as in due order an odd numbered year comes, at which time a new Woman's Committee will be elected.

The article, as reported by the committee, was adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: Before we go further, let me return for a moment to Article XV; it is simply a matter of editing. The secretary calls my attention to the fact that the word "Congress" is omitted there. It should read: "The constitution may be amended by a national convention, national congress, or by a referendum," etc. And then: "But all amendments made by a national convention or congress," etc. If there is no objection I will insert "National Congress."

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no objection. It will be so ordered.

DEL. MAYNARD (Colo.): Before we proceed, there is a matter in regard to the election of the Woman's Committee next January. Is it the fact that this committee that was elected here yesterday has to be re-elected next January?

A DELEGATE: Yes, or another one elected.

DEL. MAYNARD: I wish that some one who moved that would move to reconsider, as I find I was ready to move this a moment ago, but I thought the Woman's Committee were opposed to it. The Woman's Committee, or most of them, are very anxious to be retained until they have had a chance to do what they can before they go out of office, and I would be glad if some one that voted "Yes" the last time would move to reconsider.

DEL. GAYLORD: Let me suggest, our party as a party is not in the habit of wiping out of office those who are doing good work. I do not believe, if those comrades who have been elected to this committee go forward with their work, that there will be any difficulty in their being entrusted with the work for the full term following. I cannot guarantee anything, but our membership are not finicky about retaining any one in office.

The next article, numbered XVII in the

Committee's report, was then read, as follows:

"ARTICLE XVII.

"International Secretaries.

"Sec. 1. Commencing the first of January in years in which an International Socialist Congress is held, the International Secretaries to which the party may be entitled shall be elected by referendum vote, in the same manner as the members of the National Executive Committee. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner."

On motion the article was adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: Article XVIII brings us to this foreign-speaking proposition. A few words of introduction, I think, will help you to understand the situation. There has been a problem in our party for some years. This is a supplementary report that we wanted to take up last night. A few words of introduction, and I will try to make it short. A Lithuanian comrade came to us, asking if we took in the Lithuanian comrades. He told us that they had 2,500 members, that they are Socialists, that many of them, when they come to this country, are Socialists, that they do not understand the English language, and, of course, it is difficult to co-operate in any way with the other people who are Socialists in this country. In one town in Illinois, being the great majority there, a mining town, I believe, they have elected their own Mayor, but not on the Socialist ticket because they are not members of the Socialist party. There is a Socialist local there, I believe. He told us that they cannot co-operate, though, because of the barrier of language, and they have no means of getting together locally or otherwise. They are paying their own dues; they have their own paper; they have a national organization; they are working and carrying a card and they wear a button. They want to be entitled to be known as members of the Socialist Party of America. They want to co-operate with us, and they made us a proposition.

But, as we talked it over the comrade himself said, "I can see from your point of view that we are not quite ready and you are not quite ready yet," and in the most beautiful fashion of comradeship and with a look of disappointment on his face that hurt me, he withdrew from the conference in the sweetest spirit and said, "Well, we will wait and work a little longer." You have known that there are a good many comrades here from the foreign-speaking organizations sitting as fraternal delegates, in the congress, but not of it, and certainly something of a disturbing element, because they felt they did not have the recognition they were entitled to, and we felt it, but we did not know what to do. They sent us communications stating the things they asked, and they came in with a proposition, expecting it to be cut in two, and we could not consider their proposition, because, under the present constitution, we could not even meet them half way. Nevertheless we felt that something ought to be done, and we began thrashing the thing out between us personally. Yesterday the committee got together, and this is the result. Here are foreign-speaking comrades coming to us from other countries, speaking their own language. They can get together among themselves, but they cannot come to us and work, because the barrier of the foreign language is there. The Finns are unusually strong in their own country, unusually well trained, unusually capable of organization, and they have solved the problem by getting together in regular fashion, electing and paying their own translator, who simply has desk room in the national office. The Finns have 5,000 members now who pay their national dues, and I think, we remit half of the dues in Wisconsin to them. These comrades have been asking us to give them half of the national dues and half of the state and local dues. We said we could not speak for the state and local organization, but we began to work it out, and this is our proposition:

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE XV.

FOREIGN SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 1. National organizations working in languages other than English shall have the right to affiliate with the Socialist Party as herein provided.

Sec. 2. Such organizations shall number at least 500 members and shall accept and be in harmony with the constitution and platform of the Socialist Party.

Sec. 3. Such organizations shall pay a sum of five cents monthly per capita to the National Office, receiving in exchange therefor due stamps similar to those issued to English speaking organizations.

Sec. 4. Such national organizations shall have the right to elect an officer to be known as Translator-Secretary, who shall be conversant with their own and the English language, and whose duty it shall be to serve in the National Office as a medium of communication between their organization and the national organization of the Socialist Party. The wages of such Translator-Secretary shall not be more than twenty-five dollars per week and shall be paid by the National Office of the Socialist Party, the exact sum to be fixed by the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party.

Sec. 5. Each national foreign speaking organization shall be entitled to elect one fraternal delegate, to national conventions or congresses of the Party, provided that such delegates shall have a voice but no vote.

Sec. 6. Members of foreign speaking organizations shall have no voice in national referendums or in the election of national officers of the Socialist Party except when they vote as members of a state organization.

Sec. 7. All political action by such organizations shall be subject to the supervision and approval of the respective state organizations, and no propaganda action shall be taken by them which is objectionable to the respective state organizations.

Sec. 8. The members of the various foreign speaking organizations shall have voice and vote in the respective local and state organizations only on such terms as may be mutually fixed by them and by the state organizations.

RESOLUTION ON FOREIGN SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS.

Whereas, The foreign speaking organizations are under the burden of special expense for their special propaganda; and,

Whereas, It is particularly desirable that the foreign speaking population of these states shall become an integral part of the political action of the Socialist Party of America; and,

Whereas, The state is the unit of political action in the United States; therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Congress recommend strongly to all respective state organizations that they grant charters to locals and branches of foreign speaking organizations, on conditions which shall return to the latter fifty per cent of the state and local dues; and, be it further

Resolved, That our foreign speaking comrades are reminded that the Socialist Party of America exists for the purpose of furnishing a political weapon to the working class of America; and that they are therefore under the necessity, as Socialists, of joining and co-operating with their state and local organizations.

Recommended for adoption by the Committee on Constitution:

W. R. GAYLORD, *Chairman*.
ELLA REEVE BLOOR, *Secretary*.
JAMES DE BELL.
W. P. COLLINS.
J. STITT WILSON.
GEO. H. GOEBEL.
CAROLINE LOWE.
S. M. REYNOLDS.
JOHN M. WORK.

DEL. GAYLORD: Section 4—I might explain in regard to that that if they cannot pay the salary of the man whom they elect, that is up to them; if they need such a man and the national office can afford to pay him, perhaps they can get it. That is up to the National Executive Committee.

Secretary reads Section 5.

DEL. GAYLORD: The point on that is, that if they want to vote they will go

into the state organization as our Finnish comrades have done, who have three or four delegates on this floor.

Secretary reads Section 6.

DEL. GAYLORD: That explains itself.

The secretary than read the remainder of the supplemental report of the Committee on Constitution, and after some explanation by Chairman Gaylord, it was decided to consider it section by section.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): I move the adoption of Section 1.

DEL. WILLERT (Ohio): I did want to move to strike out the entire matter. If we adopt Section 1, it applies to all the other sections. I am one of those comrades who believe in getting all Socialists, no matter of what nationality, into the Socialist Party so that we can all act together instead of separately. We have in the city of Cleveland two Polish branches which are affiliated with the Socialist Party and three which are not. They are at war to-day. I believe that the foreign speaking comrades should be in with the English speaking comrades, working together for the co-operative commonwealth. I believe we can make more progress and that the foreign speaking comrades can make more progress if they are in our organization with the American comrades than they can separately. I say to them: "You are in America now; get into the American movement." I move that the whole matter relating to foreign-speaking organizations be not concurred in.

DEL. LAUKKI (Minn.): If there is trouble among the foreign-speaking organizations in Cleveland, it is because you American people don't want to help us. If you get the foreign-speaking organizations in touch with the American organization, you will save the fights and the trouble. The Finnish comrades had this trouble until we got our secretary-translator. If you have a referendum now, we have it in our Finnish locals and discuss it and debate on it and vote on it intelligently. We have three Finnish papers and each and every subject that is up for the referendum is printed in the papers weeks before the referendum. It is talked about in the locals; and we act intelligently on them as a part of the Socialist Party. Why do the foreign-speaking organizations want these separate organizations? All they ask is that they have the same rights with you; that they can have their own translator-secretary and carry on their own organization work. We have some people who are not Socialists and when an English speaking agitator comes to town they do not understand him. We have nearly all the time three Finnish agitators in the field. They are paid from these extra fees that are spoken of here. The Finnish comrades pay higher dues than the English speaking comrades. May they not maintain their organization, their translator-secretary, and pay their dues to the National Party also so that they can vote

on things that touch them? I find some of the comrades have misunderstood me. I stand for this report.

DEL. HUBSCHMITT (N. J.): While I am not a foreign-speaking representative, I think I know something about this. I was secretary of a local with twelve branches and seven different nationalities in it, and I was thrown out of a branch of the Socialist Party when I tried to explain to them the rules; we had members who didn't pay dues. We had three Polish speaking organizations, and we had a Mayday celebration where one of the dues paying organizations was not permitted to take part in the celebration. And it was all due to this complex method of purchasing dues stamps. I find from talking with the foreign-speaking comrades that the great trouble at present is that they receive no recognition from the National Organization. I think in this report there is contained the solution for most of this difficulty; not all of it; because the three paragraphs which refer to purchasing dues stamps cause a lot of trouble. I think that if they have each a secretary-translator in the National Office, that a great deal of that trouble will be eliminated and that all these referendums and other things that go to the party can go from the National Office. But, I think these provisions about purchasing stamps are not the best plan. Let them purchase the stamps from the state secretary as they do at present.

DEL. VALIMAKI (Finnish): We have been discussing this for several days between the committees and the representatives of the foreign-speaking organizations, and we have come to the conclusion that the Socialist Party has got to do something for these weak and young foreign-speaking organizations in order to help them out, in building up the Socialist movement among the men and women of their nationalities, on the same lines that we Finns have already built.

I believe, if you want to reach the foreign-speaking working men of this country, if you want to reach the eleven million workers that are toiling in the industries of this country, you must give them some rights, some official standing. You must give them a right to organize on National lines; that means that you must leave the work of organizing and educating the foreigners largely in the hands of those people who know how to reach their own class, who know the history of their people, who know the conditions under which they are living here, who know the psychology of their people. You may be

able to reach them, but not so easily and not so effectively. This comrade from Cleveland said the foreigners should come into the American Socialist movement. We foreigners all agree that this is the American movement and we want to get into the American movement; but we have to find ways and means to get in. If you just give the foreign-speaking organizations what the committee has proposed here, you just give them what we need. You have a plan by which you can get many thousand Poles into the organization; you have a plan by which you can get the Lithuanian organization into the movement; you have a plan by which you can get the Jewish workmen into the movement; these representatives here today represent millions of foreign-speaking working men. We want to make those foreigners in the first place Socialists, and when they become Socialists they know that they got to take up the fight wherever they reside. They know they have got to fight the capitalists whether they are in the United States or in Europe. And when they begin to fight the American capitalists they soon learn that they must learn English before they can fight them effectively. I ask you to adopt this report.

DEL. NOVAK (Bohemian): I speak as a member of the party for the rights of the foreign speaking members of the party. It is the impression that some of the delegates have that we are seeking to get on some of the committees. But that is not so. As it is now, we pay our dues to the locals; we buy English literature, English newspapers, and we pay the same dues as the English speaking comrade does. But, besides this we have to keep up our Bohemian daily paper; we have to keep up two weekly Bohemian papers; and we have to keep up the Bohemian organization out of our own pockets and get very little of it back. All we ask is, that we do not have to pay twice as much as the English speaking comrades do. If the comrade here who thinks we ought to be in the American movement, will remember that there are foreigners who come to this country and are here thirty to fifty years and never learn to speak the English language, he will change his mind, because that man will never become a member of an English speaking branch because he cannot speak their language. He cannot understand what they are talking about. I have come to the conclusion that the only thing to do is to organize them in affiliation with the Socialist Party in their own language; we

want to be on the same plane with our English speaking comrades; that is all.

DEL. FACKERT (N. J.): I am afraid this will complicate matters. In Hudson County we have two Italian branches, a Finnish branch and a Swedish branch. Now, if we adopt this, we are going to have trouble with these foreign branches. They will be in doubt as to which organization they ought to affiliate with. I will therefore offer as a substitute for the whole the following: "On application to the national office of five hundred or more members of the Socialist Party speaking a foreign language a translator in their language shall be employed at a cost of not more than twenty-five dollars a week." I think that will cover the matter without causing the trouble that this will.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I am a foreigner for two days of every week; because I am the editor of a foreign paper, that is, a German paper. I understand the difficulty of organizing men who do not speak the English language. I remember when the official language of the national party was German. Then it became German and English; and finally English. The only nationality that is not represented here is the German nationality. Now they absolutely fuse themselves with the American movement; and that is what you all have to do sooner or later. I am in favor of this report with one important exception. You have seven different nationalities. Now, they ask you to pay twenty-five dollars a week.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are wasting your speech, Comrade Berger; they fixed that as a limit.

DEL. BERGER: Even so; suppose you make it twenty dollars. That is the lowest you can live on in Chicago. I would not offer a translator less than twenty dollars a week in Chicago; he could not live decently. I am absolutely willing this should be done if it can be done. But it is a simple question of revenue; where will you find the money? With each nationality having five hundred members you get twenty-five dollars and you pay out over eighty dollars. If you can show me how it is to be done I am in favor of it.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I think this was the hardest proposition that this committee had to deal with. There are two sides to this question. We want these foreign-speaking Socialists to work with us hand in hand, and it is simply a problem of how to do it. We have had these foreign-speaking representatives working with our committee and we have asked

them what they want; and they have told us. An other matter: we have here a complete plan that we have figured out. Now, if you cut out any part of it you spoil the plan. Every part goes with every other part. Look at the matter of expenses; I will speak of that because it is the most important. We sat down with the foreign speaking representatives last night and we figured up how many foreign-speaking organizations might take advantage of this plan. I think we figured on a minimum basis of seven hundred members to each group on the average; and that will be very low; and we figured on a basis of seventy-five dollars a month for the translator; and we figured that if the funds came in as we believe they will that instead of being a loss to the Socialist Party of the United States, the plan will yield to the party sixty dollars a month of profit. Facts beat theories every time. The probabilities are that if it now gave us even money, in three months it would be more than even money. The Finns, I think, numbered four thousand when they came in; and they now number six thousand, and last night we were told that before the year is out they will number ten thousand. That is the way this plan will work.

Now my comrades from Paterson and from Cleveland spoke of the local troubles that they have had. We knew that they had local difficulties and because we knew that we said that our national convention should not butt into those local difficulties; and we said we better let them settle their local arrangements in those states themselves, and these foreign-speaking comrades who want to carry the red card and be members of the party, the party will show them how to do it. We will allow them to pay direct to the National Office five cents and we will have a National Translator-Secretary, and then they will know what is going on; and they will have the red card, and the red button, and can call themselves members of the National Socialist Party. If in the future they want to take part in the local or the state work, they will go to their state organizations and say, "We are not satisfied to remain outside; we want to work with you; let us get together, and see if we can't find an arrangement." The arrangement that we have suggested is this: They shall say to the foreign-speaking organizations, "All right, come in; we are glad to have you. We will give you back fifty per cent of the dues that you pay in the locals and state, in order to help you in your

political work." But if they could not agree they would still be simply members of the national party, but they would have no special rights except that they would have a translator; some one that knew their ways; that knew their language to tell them our ways and our language; that is all.

Now, in order that this plan might be clear and distinctly understood, we put in a number of articles that may be unnecessary, but they were put in, because we wanted no confusion. We say, for example, that they shall elect their national officers; but we say they shall not elect ours. Now, as a member of this committee, I know the difficulties that we are facing in this matter of the foreign-speaking organizations. I know something of them in our city of Newark, and knowing these things I feel sure that we have here the only plan yet suggested that would work. And I believe if it is adopted that in a very few months there will be other nationalities coming in with thousand and thousands of members who will add greatly to the power and influence of the Socialist movement.

DEL. GAYLORD: As Chairman of the committee I would like to introduce one who has had great experience in leading the Finns to their present position of influence. He is not a delegate, but he knows a great deal about this question. I move that Comrade Hendrickson be heard on this matter.

The motion was seconded and carried.

COMRADE HENDRICKSON: Do you say that a man has to understand English to be a Socialist? We, who have agitated among the foreigners do not think that you understand the situation. You want them to understand Socialism in the English language before they can be Socialists. Now we agitated among the Finns in the Finnish language and I ask the comrade Secretary and I ask you as members of the Socialist Party, do we ask anything from the English speaking comrades, or have we given something? We have been denied many things, but we have given to you. We gave a thousand dollars to the Red Special. And we will give you a million votes yet. I went to Wyoming when that state was wholly unorganized. Who organized that state? We Finnish people did. Who furnished the money? We did. They talk of the quarreling and the fighting among the foreign-speaking comrades. There is no fighting and quarreling among the Finns since you organized us in the Finnish language. We understand the

Finnish and we get along. We are not asking anything from the English speaking comrades. We give funds for them. We vote money for their work. But there are the Swedes and the Italians; they are not organized. The Swedes—there are a million Swedish people in the United States; where are they? In the church or in the saloon. We Finns stand for the rights of labor all over the world and that is why we are Socialists.

DEL. AALTONEN (Mich.): What we ask is the right to talk in our own language. Do we ask anything else? We like to be in the American movement. Only a little over five years ago I came to Michigan. There wasn't then, to my knowledge, a Socialist in the whole upper peninsula of Michigan. Some of the old country Finnish boys came to that country, and they organized the Finnish Socialists, and, of course, we didn't know anything about the Socialist movement in the United States, and we only knew of the movement in Finland. That was our experience. We came to Michigan and we organized the movement. When we heard that there was a party in the United States called the Socialist Party, we figured that it might be the same thing that we represented, and then we tried to find ways and means to get into the American Socialist movement—to get organized into your party. About four years ago we organized the Finnish National Socialist organization. There was something like a thousand members joined at once. After four years' experience and four years of existence we have about six thousand dues paying members in the American Socialist movement. We have six papers in America; two in Canada and four in the United States. We spend for Socialistic agitation over one hundred thousand dollars every year. We have halls all over the United States; halls for Socialist propaganda; halls for preaching the new, modern civilization; halls for our women; halls for our men; halls for our children; where we educate them in Socialism. We have in those halls over half a million dollars' worth of property. That is only a little nationality. There are not more than three hundred thousand Finns in this country. If we grow as we have in the past, it is but a short time before we have every Finn in this country a Socialist.

Now, so far as our organization is concerned, we elect the translator by a referendum. We pay him eighteen dollars a week to stay in the National office; he translates all that is necessary. We

always keep three organizers in the field, three Finnish organizers—sometimes we have had as many as seven in the field at one time, and, of course, we keep track of those organizers, and so on; keep their records, and their finances; and this is costing our organization eighteen dollars every week for the salary of this man. Of course, there is postage and those expenses. All of this means that free autonomy of the foreign-speaking organization, or the right to work in their own language, will help the spread of Socialism among the foreign speaking population of this country; it will help them to build up their own organization, so that it may be effective among their own nationality. That is the only right that those people ask. They don't want to be separate; they don't want to withdraw from the party; they want to join in the party. Here is a comrade that said there are five Polish locals in Cleveland, two in the party and three outside. Why are they outside? Because they could not come in and work in their own language? When you go to one of the Italians or Poles and talk to him in English about the party, he does not understand. This is all the privilege we ask; to conduct our work in our own tongue until we learn the American tongue.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): As a member of the committee I want to refer to one or two points in order to answer some of the comrades who seem to have a misunderstanding of this proposition. There were various conflicting propositions before the committee, presented by the various foreign-speaking representatives, and we worked hard to find some programme that would permit them to organize and do the work they wanted to do for Socialism, and by way of preface I want to say that if you accept this proposition of the committee, although I am not a prophet, I will say that within two years you will have eight or ten translator-secretaries at work in the national office representing organizations that will number from 3,000 to 12,000 members.

Now, here is something you may overlook: There is hardly a foreign language that the immigrants of that nationality don't come here by the tens and hundreds and thousands each year; they know Socialism in their own tongue; they know the economic conditions in their own country, and they know the names of the various things in their own country, but they do not know the same things here and consequently they are not able in-

telligently to ally themselves with the English speaking movement here. And in order to permit the comrades of those nationalities to join in the Socialist movement and to allow them to have their own organizations subject to the National Executive Committee, and subject to the condition under which they can join the movement in their respective states, we have devised this plan. And if we fail to do this, we allow our enemies to use these foreign-speaking workers for their own purposes and against our movement.

Now the question is asked: how about the payment of the dues? How are you going to find out who have paid their dues? Well, the substitute offered here makes worse confusion than we have now. Now the Constitution Committee have worked this matter out and they have fixed the maximum wage for the Translator-Secretary at twenty-five dollars a week, leaving the exact salary to be fixed by the National Executive Committee, based, of course, upon the amount of income that is being received from the respective organizations. Then, if the income is not sufficient, they can give them an appropriation and bring them up to that point. Comrade Gaylord has given an illustration from the Lithuanian organization, where they have actually captured a town out in this state. That organization stated it was impossible for them to pay the regular dues of Illinois, but they did say that if they could get fifty per cent back they could join the organization; and the reason for this was that they have a paper that they are supporting in their own language; but they now have an organization of 2,500 people that will come into the Socialist movement. This programme taken as a whole will allow the organization of these people everywhere, and then, if they wish to take full share in the local and state organization, it will eventually result in their joining the regular local and state organizations of the party, and will eventually result in a tremendous gain for the Socialist Party of the United States.

DEL. NASH (Minn.): A great deal of this trouble is from a misunderstanding. We have tried the plan of bringing all the comrades of all nationalities into one organization, and we have always had trouble, because, if some one wanted to make trouble he would get hold of these comrades who did not understand our language, and they were used as a factor to create trouble. And then they have organized locals by themselves. Some of the comrades say if they are

going to pay national dues where do we come in? I will tell you where we come in in Minnesota. The Finnish comrades have been organized by themselves and we had no more trouble with them. Before that, we did have some trouble, when they were organized with us. Now I will tell you where we come in. The last part of the month after the dues are paid down here in Chicago I received a check from the National Translator and it runs all the way from forty-five up to one hundred and seventy-five dollars. That is where we come in. That will answer some of the comrades who complained that the state would get nothing. Fifty per cent of the dues that they pay outside of the National dues goes to the state organization. I do not understand that there is to be any change in that. We are giving the Lettish comrades the same deal; and we are giving the Hungarians the same deal. They are becoming interested; and they are taking part in the movement. When they met with us they could not understand one word in fifty that was spoken.

I believe the method suggested here is the very best thing that can be done.

A DELEGATE: You say the dues are remitted by the Finnish Translator; what proportion of that goes to the locals in which these branches are situated?

DEL. NASH: The dues are fifteen cents; five cents goes to the National organization; five cents goes to the state organization; and five cents remains for the Finnish comrades and goes for the Finnish translator.

DEL. SKALA (Bohemian): The foreign-speaking Socialists want to see the Socialist Party of America grow and get into power. Before the Milwaukee election we sent ten thousand pieces of Bohemian literature through Milwaukee from the Bohemian branch in Milwaukee and after they won their victory we shook hands with them and congratulated them as Socialists. Now the point is, that we ought to reach these foreigners as soon as they come to this country and keep them in our organizations. There are very few delegates here, I believe, who do not agree that we must have the foreign speaking organizations. Here in Chicago are eleven locals that maintain a separate organization in the Bohemian language, and that are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Those union locals number 2,800 members; they ought to belong to us. That shows that even the labor unions recognize the necessity of having foreign-speaking organizations.

Because some of the nationalities cannot come in as individuals, they organize them on national lines. We have a great difficulty in getting the foreigners into the Socialist Party. There are immigrants that come to this country who have been reading Socialist literature in their own language, that are well acquainted with the Socialist theories, but when they come here, we are unable to reach them; and there are some Socialists who come here as immigrants, who were Socialists in the old country; and they join our organization, but we are not able to hold them in our organization. But the trouble is that a great burden has been placed upon us by the Socialist Party. Our expenses practically amount to double. We have to pay regular dues to the Socialist Party; we have to maintain our secretary; we have to hire our own speakers; publish our own papers and literature.

I hope you will vote for these resolutions.

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.): A point of information: whether or not the foreign-speaking organizations by paying dues direct to the National Office will under this plan have the right to vote in party affairs without being under the control of the local organization. That is the whole question at issue with me.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): That, as presented in this plan, will depend entirely upon the terms upon which the foreign-speaking organizations and the respective state organizations may agree. It will depend upon the terms mutually agreed upon between the state organizations and the foreign-speaking organizations when they fix the terms upon which they come into the state organization.

DEL. HURST (R. I.): That was a point in which I was very much interested. But there is another point: Comrade Nash has referred to the method they have had in their state. Now I contend there is no provision in this plan which would perpetuate the condition which they have enjoyed and found so satisfactory. My contention is that under this proposition the state organization would receive nothing except by some special arrangement made between the state organization and the particular foreign-speaking organization.

DEL. GAYLORD: If the state received nothing then the foreign-speaking comrades would have no voice or vote in state affairs. At the same time they would be subject to state control, as to all matters of state propaganda, which they might wish to carry on in that state.

If the state organizations received nothing from the foreign-speaking organizations it would be either because the state organization had agreed not to receive anything or because the foreign-speaking organization and its members had been given no voice or vote in the state's affairs. And under the constitution the state organization would nevertheless have control in all matters of propaganda that the foreign-speaking organizations might wish to carry on in the state.

I think you will find this programme pretty well put together as a whole.

DEL. HURST: Then, as I understand it, if in the future the Minnesota comrades decline to have further arrangements with these organizations, then the checks will stop coming from Chicago.

DEL. GAYLORD: Delegate Nash now has an arrangement by which that amount is returned to the state secretary. Now, if it should be determined that it should be returned to the local secretaries, or the branch secretaries, that will be the arrangement. But it must be satisfactory to the state organization, and the foreign-speaking organizations. They have an arrangement with them. If they want to change it they can.

DEL. HURST: I submit then that this will eliminate that revenue.

DEL. GAYLORD: Do you so understand it, Comrade Nash?

DEL. NASH: I do not. Neither do the Finnish comrades. We have no expectation that there will be any change. We have the same with the Hungarians, and the same with the Lettish, and the same with the Polish. I do not think any of them will ask to have it changed.

DEL. HURST: "Section 3: Such organizations shall pay a sum of five cents monthly per capita to the National office, receiving in exchange therefor due stamps similar to those issued to English speaking organizations."

Does that go the state secretary?

DEL. GAYLORD: If they are not members of the state organization that goes to the translator direct; and the foreign-speaking organization has no connection whatever with the state organization.

DEL. HURST: That is an option open to them at all times?

DEL. GAYLORD: Yes.

DEL. HURST: Then I submit that they may proceed at once to eliminate the state organization irrespective of Comrade Nash or anybody else; and proceed to pay the five cents to the National Office. The Socialist Party of that state

will have nothing to do with them so far as the money is concerned; but if they choose to make terms with the state organization it will be on such terms as are mutually agreeable; and unless they make such terms they have no voice or vote—we concede that—but they have the option whether they make terms with the state or not? That is the proposition?

DEL. GAYLORD: Yes; but the state can control their propaganda and prevent them carrying on their work of that kind if it wishes. It means that if they don't make terms they must still be unobjectionable to the state organization. Do you see, comrade??

DEL. HURST: I see that; but there is another point. It seems to me that even with that understanding it would create confusion. There would not be the same smooth working that there would be under this substitute, which provides that there must be five hundred members paying their dues through the state secretary in the ordinary manner. And if our foreign-speaking comrades are as well qualified as I believe they are; and up in Rhode Island, they are among the best qualified members we have—I am not trying to throw anything in the way of the foreign-speaking comrades—as I say, they are the best we have there; but I do believe that this substitute would remove friction.

DEL. GAYLORD: What is your proposition, Comrade Hurst?

DEL. HURST: I claim that if they paid their dues to the state secretary in the regular way, and have the National office furnish them with this translator, that they could go on with the propaganda as they have shown themselves well able to do in the past, and that a much greater benefit would come to the party than under the committee's proposition.

NATIONAL SECRETARY BARNES: I feel that this is the most important question that has come before this congress. In 1904, the National Convention deliberated on this for about four hours and then referred it to the National Committee. The National Committee, shortly following that time, gave it consideration; and the National Executive Committee since that time has given it consideration, at least on nine separate occasions; but we have never defined a policy. I have my doubts about the workings of the present proposal, but I will say this for it: If it is to be tried it should be tried in its entirety; just as it is. There are certain proportions maintained throughout the plan, one section being arranged

with due regard to the other sections, and it makes a complete proposition. So I believe there should be no division; and no amendment to it. It stands as a whole. However, it does not present a complete relief from the difficulties presented by the foreign-speaking organizations, the principal one of which is their release from the extra burden placed upon them in their present relations with the local party organizations.

The point is this: The Finnish comrades pay their regular party dues in their respective localities, or the state dues in their respective states, and over and above that they pay a certain amount to their national organization. The same thing is true of the Polish and a number of other organizations. Now, that is a burden from which they are seeking relief. This proposition, if they maintain their present status, does not give them that relief. But on the other hand, this arrangement will give them a translator, but the individual member pays exactly the amount he does to-day. He will pay more than you and I English speaking comrades pay. Now, if the foreign comrades understand that and accept it, it is all right. But there is nothing in this that warrants Comrade Nash in expecting the continuation of his present arrangement; that is a matter between his state and the various foreign organizations; that may be maintained if they are willing. We hope that it will be. But, if the comrades are looking for release from the higher dues that they pay, I question whether it is not an inducement for them to take the open National door and forget their local attachments. Of course, I see the point made by Comrade Gaylord, that then they lose certain rights that they otherwise would have in the state and local organizations. But it has been the higher dues that kept the Lithuanian comrades, that have been mentioned, out of our organization.

I hope, if adopted, this will be adopted in its entirety so that it can be tried out, and experience will then show whether it is feasible or not.

Here is another point: the Polish comrades and the Bohemian and several others have endeavored to establish in the past two years with the state organizations, the same relations regarding dues and the same financial terms as have been mutually agreed upon by the states with the Finnish organization. The Finnish Translator sends on the 26th, 27th or 28th of each month a complete report to the state secretaries of the states in which

the Finnish locals are found, and this report recites the number of locals that pay dues to the National Finnish Translator in every state, and the proportion of that amount that belongs to the National organization the translator pays into the National Office. The amount that belongs to the state he sends in the form of a check. Now the Polish and other organizations have tried to enter into the same arrangement with the state secretaries, and the state secretaries have in every instance refused for the reason that they would have to wait before making up their own financial report until they had received a report from five or six or more translators of each of the different nationalities. And the state organizations, wherever this has been broached, have refused to adopt this plan. I believe that we should give every encouragement to these foreign speaking comrades, and these foreign speaking organizations; and this plan may be tried. If you are in doubt after the discussion, then adopt the substitute, which, after all, secures the main thing, that of establishing a translator for each organization.

DEL. BERGER: Do you favor this?

SECRETARY BARNES: I am willing to give it a trial, unless there is further objection developed.

DEL. WILLERT (Ohio): It is no spirit of antagonism that has brought up this issue. Plainly stating the facts, as Comrade Barnes has stated them, this question is of vital importance. It is our object to bring into the Socialist movement the working class, no matter of what nationality, and drill them in discipline, drill them in Socialism. I may not understand the fundamental philosophy of Socialism, but I do understand organization. I have been in the labor world for twenty-eight years and I believe I know something of organization. In this plan, all I can see is the dividing of the working class. I did not say that we wanted the foreign-speaking comrades to come into the American branches. I said I wanted them to come into the American Party, the American movement. We want you to have branches of your own; but we want you to send delegates to the central bodies so that we can take up these various questions and discuss them, and know where we are at. In the City of Cleveland your Finns are not connected with the National Translator's office. They are in Local Cleveland and one of the best branches we have. That is where they belong. We are talking about buying dues stamps from the

National Office. Who is going to give these various branches or organizations the right to violate Section 4, of Article XII? The state organizations will determine that. You cannot stop us selling dues stamps to any other organization. Don't forget that. I would like to see that changed; I would like to see the national party predominant in this country; and because we don't have that condition, we have so much of this trouble.

It is not a question of dues at all. The dues question does not come into it with the Finnish comrades of Cleveland. They pay their regular dues to Local Cleveland, and besides that they pay extra dues. They support the Finnish papers; they give entertainments; they held an entertainment a month ago that netted \$200. We don't say that they shall come into the local branches; but we do want them to be connected with the central body; we want one grand organization. And I hope the time will soon come when we become one grand army of the working class and do away with state autonomy. We must consolidate the whole movement throughout the United States.

DEL. CAREY (Mass.): I want to state briefly that in Massachusetts we have twenty-one Finnish clubs that work under the present arrangement. It works excellently. I am of the opinion that while the proposition as the committee has submitted it, carries with it an element of danger—the danger of creating national units in the state—I am also of the opinion that something must be done in this matter and this is the only concrete proposition that we have had before us. We have got to begin somewhere and learn. If we make a mistake; if it is found to harass the state organizations, or is found to be embarrassing financially or to build up national units within the state, then that can be brought to the attention of the party and the mistake rectified. But something should be done promptly and so I shall vote for the proposition as submitted by the committee with the full knowledge that some danger may arise. It will not arise, because of our Finnish organization, because they are for the organization, men and women, and they never bolt, or split, or threaten. They do their work according to the decisions of the organization. But some of the other organizations have a tendency to build up a sort of distinct organization. But with all these dangers, I suggest to the delegates that they should vote for this proposition,

for the same reason that you allow a child to walk; you know it will fall; but if it did not try to walk it never would walk, and so with the possibility of falling here, we still have the possibility of rectifying the mistake. So I shall vote for the original report as submitted.

The motion for the previous question was moved and seconded, and carried.

The report of the Committee on Con-

sideration in Regard to Foreign-Speaking Organizations was then adopted.

A motion to suspend the rules having been adopted, Delegate Lee moved, seconded by several delegates, that the report of the Committee on Resolutions follow immediately after the conclusion of the discussion of the report of the Committee on Constitution. Carried.

Adjourned until May 21, 1910, 9 A. M.

SEVENTH DAY'S SESSION.

The congress was called to order at nine o'clock by Secretary Roewer.

Delegate Gaylord of Wisconsin was elected Chairman of the day.

REPORT ON CONSTITUTION.

Consideration of the report of the Committee on Constitution was resumed, Delegate Goebel taking charge of the report on behalf of the committee.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): In regard to the last article in the printed form that you have before you, there is a

little doubt as to the exact number, owing to the insertion of the article in regard to foreign-speaking organizations. The article reads:

"All amendments shall take effect sixty days after being approved by the membership."

On motion the article was adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now ready for the minority reports on the constitution. There is one that Comrade Lowe will present. Comrade Lowe is recognized for the minority.

MINORITY REPORT ON CONSTITUTION.

We, the minority of the Committee on Constitution dissenting from the report of the majority as to the provisions in Section 1, Article VI of the Constitution, recommend that said Section 1, Article VI be amended to read as follows:

"The National Executive Committee shall be composed of seven members, one to be chosen from each one of the following geographical districts of the United States by a National Referendum of the Party membership issued to the Locals of the Party in such districts by the National Secretary. The call for nominations shall be issued to the locals in said districts by the National Secretary on the first day of October in years of uneven numbers; each Local shall be entitled to nominate seven candidates. Thirty days shall be allowed for nomination, fifteen for acceptances and declinations and fifty for the referendum. Nominations from five Locals shall entitle a candidate to be placed on the ballot. The candidate in each of said districts receiving the highest vote shall be elected. Vacancies shall be filled by the National Committee from membership within the district where such vacancies occur. Members of the Executive Committee may be recalled by a referendum vote in the manner provided for referendums in Article XI hereof, except that in such cases the initiative shall not be held open for thirty days but shall be sent out immediately."

DISTRICT I.

Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York.

DISTRICT II.

Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, Ohio.

DISTRICT III.

North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee.

DISTRICT IV.

Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Texas.

DISTRICT V.

Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa.

DISTRICT VI.

North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Montana, Wyoming, New Mexico.

DISTRICT VII.

Washington, Idaho, Oregon, California, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska.

Respectfully submitted by the Minority Committee on the Constitution.

(Signed) JAS. A. DE BELL, Mass.
CAROLINE A. LOWE, Kansas.
JOHN M. WORK, Iowa.
S. M. REYNOLDS, Ind.

DEL. LOWE (Kas.): As a member of the minority I wish to speak in favor of the adoption of the minority report just read. We ask that the entire territory of the United States be divided into geographical districts; that the entire membership in the election of the National Executive Committee elect one member of this committee from each of these sections.

By doing so what is it we insure? We insure to the national Socialist movement a national representation in its executive body of the Socialist Party of America.

Today, what have we? A sectional representation. Five members of the National Executive Committee are in the vicinity of New York.

What is the result? The result is a great loss to our national movement because of the fact that the interests of the various sections of the country are not understood.

It was almost the unanimous decision of this conference that we could not vote intelligently upon the immigration Committee because we are not sufficiently familiar with the main facts on this important question.

To those of us living away from the coast and its vicinity, the immigration problem means very little. We are not faced day after day with perplexing questions that we must answer upon this subject. Because we do not come into contact with it and because we do not come into more close contact with our comrades who must face it, we are left in ignorance of it. But when we find many of our best informed, our most devoted comrades standing firmly for the exclusion of certain races, we are forced to a realization of the fact that a great national issue is at stake. A national issue upon which we as Socialists must take

our stand, and we feel sadly the need of more enlightenment upon this subject.

Just as some of our arguments upon this question must have appeared pitifully ridiculous to those who really understand it, just so did some of the discussions upon the problems of our comrades upon the farms of Kansas and Oklahoma appear pitifully ignorant to those of us who represent these sections.

They spoke contemptuously of the owning farmer of Oklahoma and Texas. They did not know that they were speaking of that which is almost a myth. The owning farmer in these states has scarcely an existence.

Comrades, you do not understand. Could you but live in their wretched cabins, toil with them from daylight until dark—their wives and babies sacrificed in the cotton fields of the South—could you but see the eagerness with which they grasp our message—when they ask for bread you would not give them a stone.

Why should not a comrade residing in the South, understanding their lives and problems, represent them upon the National Executive Committee?

I must take this opportunity to make my position clear upon the subject under discussion yesterday. A misunderstanding arose upon the farmers' program of Oklahoma. I must call your attention to its opening and closing sentences.

"As measures calculated to bring into collective property the land, and enable the farmer to have the use and occupancy of the land sufficient for a home and the support of his family, we hereby advocate and pledge our elected officers to the following program."

"Land now in the possession of the

state or hereafter acquired through purchase, reclamation or tax sales to be rented to landless farmers under the supervision of the Board of Agriculture at the prevailing rate of share rent or its equivalent. The payment of such rent to cease as soon as the total amount of rent paid is equal to the value of the land, and the tenant thereby acquires for himself and his children the right of occupancy. The title to all such lands remaining with the commonwealth."

My work is in Kansas. But for six months, day after day, I have met with our comrades upon the farms of Oklahoma. Never once did I dodge the issue. Always, unequivocally, have I stood firm upon the plank in our national platform for collective ownership of all land used for the purpose of exploitation. Had I but once attempted to deny this principle, the Socialist farmers of Oklahoma would have arisen in indignation and denounced such a statement. The Socialist farmers of Oklahoma and Kansas realize that the man who controls the crop owns the crop, and that the man who owns the crop owns the farm. They are demanding the ownership of the crops—the full product of their labor—and will be content with nothing less. The farmers' program is but the attempted first step in the accomplishment of this end.

I find it is our comrades of the city who have not come into contact with the farmer who are fearful of him. You think of him as a land-owning laborer—employing class. He is a tenant serf, enslaved with his wife and children, bound hand and foot by the money lender and land owner.

Because the Socialism in an agricultural state must of necessity be an agricultural movement, just so the Socialist program in an agricultural state must be an agricultural program.

And this, the first step to formulate such a program, has been brought before you, as I understand, not for your sanction as an official document of the Socialist Party of America, but for your earnest consideration and advice. To recommend a question so little understood was the wise and just course to pursue.

How can we come to an understanding of the problem not only of the Southern cotton belt, but the Northern wheat belt, the mining problem of the

Rockies, the labor problem of the Pacific, the factory problems of the East?

By electing on our National Executive Committee men and women who are familiar with these problems, because they are a part of their every day life, they can then deliberate intelligently upon the national problems, and the result of these deliberations will produce benefit to each section.

Not that there is the slightest feeling against our National Committee individual comrades. You have the love and the respect and confidence of the rank and file throughout every section of the country. Why? Because to a greater or lesser extent they know that you are writers, speakers through the press and on the platform; you come to them and they learn from you. You have a hearing before them. Do they have a hearing before you? The Farmers' Committee composed of, as we supposed, our best informed men upon this subject, submitted before us that to their surprise they had discovered an obscure comrade whose book knowledge of the subject was as broad as theirs and whose practical knowledge, because day after day he must meet the problems of the farmer, was even greater. There was no hesitancy upon their part in regard to receiving the experience of the hitherto unknown comrade. Eagerly they accepted his wisdom and gave him place upon their committee.

You say that to divide our United States into districts will give more room to sectional prejudices. Today we have sectional prejudices because we are isolated within our sections. Race prejudice disappears as races intermingle. The national prejudices disappear as nations, by means of the press, telegraph, telephone, are brought more closely together; sectional prejudices will disappear as the comrades from all sections become familiar with the industrial problem in all sections.

To me it does not mean that by this means we will lose the invaluable service of the Hillquits, the Bergers, the Hunters. It does mean that the men and women of keen intellect, or broad understanding, earnest devotion, from every part of this country, are given greater opportunity to serve us in our efforts to inaugurate the co-operative commonwealth. I do not ask you to vote for the minority report. I do not say that I shall vote for the minority report. If it can be proved to me that

by its adoption we shall have done that which is not to the best interest of the Socialist movement of the United States, then I shall vote against it.

What we do ask is an earnest discussion, free from impassioned prejudice, a discussion that has ever uppermost the intimate welfare of the greatest cause this world has ever known.

DEL. CORY (Wash.): I move that the minority report be substituted for the majority. (Seconded.)

On motion of Delegate Jacobsen of Iowa the previous question was ordered.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the minority ready to speak? Comrade Lowe is not ready, being slightly ill. Will Comrade Reynolds represent her?

DEL. REYNOLDS (Ind.): Comrade Lowe has made a pretty good argument in behalf of the minority report. This question as it presents itself to the Socialist Party is of vastly greater importance, perhaps, than those who have moved the previous question can conceive at this time. I was myself a member of the executive committee for three or four years. I join with Comrade Lowe in saying that I have nothing but the kindest feelings toward the Executive Committee. I do object to the fact, without reference to the method through which that fact exists, that a large portion of the Executive Committee comes from one city, and almost from one state, which militates against the equitable consideration of questions that are presented to the Executive Committee, not by the membership, not by parts and portions of the United States, but by the Executive Committee themselves. I should think that the Executive Committee, desiring the advancement of Socialism, would themselves favor this minority report. They are themselves at a loss many times to know those questions that are presented here in a congress. No man can know how the Socialists of the Pacific Slope feel, unless he comes from that section, on the immigration of the orientals. No man can know how the southern comrades feel, nor how the industrial center comrades feel, nor how the farming sections feel, unless he has been in touch with them. Therefore it is that this minority report presents an opportunity to bring together members of the Executive Committee, who may formulate plans

and propaganda for the Socialist Party, that will be useful instead of otherwise. Now, our Executive Committee today is composed largely of writers—brilliant writers, it may be; I have no criticism to pass here at this congress upon their writings. But they are subject to the laws of economic determinism, and we as Socialists should be willing to put limitations upon the inherited tendencies we have to exploit our own ideas, and to exploit, perhaps, our own books and our own literature upon the movement. I know that in one or two instances it was not possible for me to get some propaganda matter published by the national organization which should have been published. Leaflets that should have been published will come up here in the Resolution Committee. The leaflets on propaganda in the army and navy, for example, have not been issued by the national office that should have been, years ago, enlightening the working class who are forced by economic conditions into the ranks of the so-called butchers of the world. We know there are excellent men under arms, and we recognize the latent comradeship that is in their hearts. I brought this question myself before the Executive Committee. I presented it here on the floor of this congress in a private way, not in public. I never was on the floor of the congress before to speak, and never asked for it. I presented that propaganda proposition, and it was turned down in the committee.

DEL. CAREY (Mass.): Will you yield to a question?

DEL. REYNOLDS: Sure.

DEL. CAREY: Will the delegate please state whether it was the Executive Committee that was elected by the recent referendum that he brought this matter before?

DEL. REYNOLDS: This present committee.

DEL. CAREY: This present existing Executive Committee?

DEL. REYNOLDS: All of them.

DEL. CAREY: Do you mean to say that I as a member of the committee—that you presented the matter to me?

DEL. REYNOLDS: No, I presented it to the national office. The National Secretary was requested to present it to the National Executive Committee. That propaganda is very important, and I believe that if we had

had in the past the geographical representation idea we would have had considered all these questions, the farm question, the immigration question, propaganda among the army and navy, and those other questions. The objection may be made that this proposition militates against state autonomy. Comrades, state autonomy is one of the relics of the past. It has, or will have some time, no significance in the Socialist movement. When we all become Socialists ultimately, state boundary lines and geographical districts will not be essential to the tactical work of the party. The domination of local ideas, local pride, local politics and local interests militate against the solidarity of the Socialist Party. In this proposition of the minority report no such thing can occur, and the state autonomists will not be interfered with tactically. No one is bound to take part in the referendum if he does not see fit. The local secretaries may send names into the national office, and if they do not or if that state does not, then that state fails to participate in the selection of a geographical representative upon the Executive Committee.

I take it that the presentation of the minority report is in accord with the fundamental principles of Socialism; and I think the majority report is not. I think that the minority report leads towards democracy in the movement, and that it will bring peace and harmony, larger intelligence, more kindness, more sympathy, more co-operation and less friction. It is one of the important things that this congress should adopt. If they do adopt it I know the result will be good. I know that the rank and file are yearning not for leadership, but for enlightenment and intelligence, and that they will welcome it and overwhelmingly approve the acts of this congress.

(Delegate Thompson was called to the Chair.)

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): Do I understand that the debate is closed?

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): The debate is closed. On behalf of the majority of the committee I wish to say a few words in closing the debate. This is not a matter of state autonomy; quite the contrary. Indeed, it is against state autonomy. I was chairman of the Committee on Constitution at the last national convention,

and as a member of that committee, I tried to secure and did secure, so far as the referendum was concerned, the election of the National Executive Committee by the national committee, which is the most representative body of the party outside of conventions and congresses. But that was destroyed by the preferential election proposition, and we are brought now to the point where we were in the convention two years ago, to have the National Executive Committee elected by a referendum of the party. I want to say that my opinion still holds good, but this proposition coming up in this form is a most preposterous thing. Now, I want to say a word concerning Comrade Lowe. She is one of the most sincere, honest, earnest and capable comrades that I know. Her only disadvantage in this matter is that her work so far has been confined to the particular district where she lives and where she knows the people intimately. What is wanted is a committee capable of working on broad lines and taking in the country as a whole. I do not know whether you understand the full nature of this proposition that is before you. I want to tell you what this means as it stands. There are seven districts, the first being Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut and New York. It constitutes 18.5 per cent of the dues paying membership, as shown by the dues paid for the first four months of 1910, and it includes 17 per cent of the population of the country.

District number 2 is Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia and Ohio. It has 20 per cent of the dues-paying membership and 21 per cent of the population.

District 3 is composed of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Kentucky and Tennessee, with 1.5 per cent of the dues-paying membership and 15.7 per cent of the population.

District 4 is Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri and Texas, containing 8.6 per cent of the dues-paying membership and 13.5 per cent of the population of the country.

District 5 is Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota and Iowa, with 25.3 per cent of the dues-paying membership and 20 per cent of the population of the country.

District 6 is North Dakota, South

Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Montana, Wyoming and New Mexico, with 16 per cent of the dues-paying membership and 7.8 per cent of the population.

District 7 is Washington, Idaho, Oregon, California, Utah, Nevada, Arizona and Alaska, with 10 per cent of the dues-paying membership and 4.5 per cent of the population of the country.

Socialism is supposed to be scientific, and the organization of the party should be based upon facts. Now, which line of facts shown here are you going to follow? If I had a map here I could show you that as to geographical districts, the proposition certainly is not scientific. As to population it does not tally. As to dues-paying membership it is preposterous. What is it that they want? I cannot understand. If I were to go more closely into this thing I could show you other objections. The industrially organized and developed parts of the world, as we understand it today, are those parts in which Socialism naturally develops first; not the agricultural portions, the most backward agricultural sections. Yet, here is a proposition to give two small populations and two small districts and two small dues-paying memberships, constituting the most backward, industrially and agriculturally, sections of the country, two representatives upon the National Executive Committee. Somebody explained that this must have been done while they were asleep.

Now, the National Executive Committee is an executive committee—an executive committee, please note. Now, an executive committee is not a legislative committee; it is an administrative committee. It is called upon to act quickly, and to act quickly it is necessary to have the members within a convenient distance and not have to wait for members thousands of miles away. Now, what is the complaint that is made? It is that these distant sections are not represented upon the committee. I have shown you the reason. These sections are backward in their development; they are backward industrially; they are backward agriculturally, these two southern sections especially, and industrially others are not as advanced as these. What harm to the party has come from the present plan? Has there been any division

of the movement, or has the movement gone forward unitedly under the present method of administration. That is a question that has to be answered. The party is not divided; the party has not suffered under this method.

A roll call was then ordered on the adoption of the minority report, resulting in 31 in favor, 45 opposed, and 34 absent or not voting, and the minority report was declared lost.

The chairman stated that there was an opportunity to present motions from the floor, and that a motion to adopt as a whole would be in order.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I move that the report be adopted as recommended in full. (Seconded.)

DEL. O'NEIL (Wyo.): I move to amend Section 3 of Article XII by adding the words: "That only excessive filing fees and legal restrictions will excuse the leaving of blanks on any ballot where there are enough dues paying members to fill the ticket."

The amendment was adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now ready for the question on the adoption of the report as a whole.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): Does the Chair rule that you would entertain amendments, but such amendments must be in writing?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Del. Merrick then offered the following amendment to take the place of the first sentence in Sec. 1 of Art. VI:

"The National Executive Committee shall be composed of seven members from the membership of the party, and they shall hold office for two years; provided, not more than one member can come from one state."

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now going to vote on adopting that as a part of the constitution.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): I want to know whether that paragraph that was read previous to the last was adopted.

THE SECRETARY: It was adopted.

DEL. THOMPSON: I move to reconsider. (Seconded.)

DEL. BERGER: Sure; it was not discussed at all. There was not a word said about it.

The motion to reconsider was put and declared lost. A division being called for, the vote resulted 42 in favor of reconsideration and 27 against.

A point of order was made that a two-thirds vote was required to re-

consider, but the point was not sustained, and the matter was reconsidered, being Del. O'Neil's amendment.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): The amendment, as I understand, proposes to force every local to put a full ticket in the field. With but one or two positions to be filled there would probably be no difficulty. But suppose there are fifteen judicial positions to be filled and but ten members, you can see it is ridiculous to say that our locals shall fill the tickets when there are not enough members. Furthermore, suppose they have members enough, but they could not take a place on the ticket because they would lose their jobs. It illustrates the fact that we have not given this proper consideration when we place articles in the constitution in that way. It is unnecessary in Wisconsin, and I believe the whole Wisconsin movement is as clear and as uncompromising and stands as much against fusion and compromise as any body of Socialists anywhere in the United States, and we are just as intelligent as anybody. We ought to leave the matter to the state or local, and if there is any fusion or confusion in any city let the state take care of it.

DEL. BERGER: I am going to leave in ten minutes. There is some labor trouble in Milwaukee, and the unions have asked me to come home. I wish to say that I think the party has gone on long enough on the old system, and well enough, so that we do not have to change. Take our situation in Milwaukee last year. We did not have lawyers enough, even that middle class party that is made up of trade unionists and other members, to fill the positions of seven city judges to be elected and the judge of the Supreme Court. Now, the judges that are elected in Milwaukee, we want them to be good, because they have to be in office five years. We had at our disposal two men, and one of those lawyers was the secretary of the Brewers' Union, the last job he took. We took those two men, and we were compelled to leave five places on the ticket empty in order to be good Socialists. This is a useless and foolish proposition. Leave it to the state. There is no foundation for suspicion or foundation for danger of fusion. In Germany they are not afraid of fusion. In France they are not afraid of fusion. But in America, especially down in

Mississippi and Georgia and Louisiana, we are continually warned against fusion. Comrades, leave the constitution as it is. It provides against any kind of fusion, treason or other affiliation of our party.

DEL. O'NEIL (Wyo.): Every state in the Union has different laws regarding its primary ballots and conventions. A great many states have laws which make restrictions with regard to ballots. In those cases this amendment would allow them that privilege of keeping members off who were not capable of running for office. In our state we can nominate any laborer and run him for the Supreme Court of the state if we want to. Suppose he could not qualify after election, you see the situation.

DEL. THOMPSON: The same as we are in Milwaukee, because we can elect them.

DEL. O'NEIL: As I understand Comrade Berger's argument, the present constitution and local regulations cover it. As far as we are concerned, we had fusion in the biggest county in our state. Of course, the rules of our party forbid fusion, nor was such a thing ever contemplated, but in spite of this they nominated a legislative ticket and had an understanding with the Democrats and left a blank on the legislative ticket. That is the condition we have to deal with. There is nothing in our constitution to protect against it. What we want is something that will stop fusion. These men will come to the members of the party and tell them that they are doing these things in other states. Now, the members have no opportunity to go and hunt up the information and find out the legal restrictions or obstructions that there are to putting a ticket in the field. They will simply accept the word of these men because of ignorance of the facts, and we are simply losing members from the party in the state. We want the comrades of the United States as a party to help us. We don't ask for restrictions to keep them off. I submit that the argument against this amendment was an argument in favor of it. All we want is something that will protect us. If you read the constitution you will find that there is nothing in it that will cope with this situation. I came to this congress to try and protect our state organizations. All we want is help.

The previous question was then ordered.

The amendment having been again read, the question was put on the adoption of the amendment, and the amendment was declared lost.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is now on the adoption or rejection of the committee's report as a whole. The question was then put, and the report as a whole was declared adopted.

Del. Morgan of Illinois requested that he be recorded as voting no.

On motion of Del. Goebel (N. J.), the rules were suspended in order to permit the Committee on Resolutions to report at this time, so far as the committee was prepared to report.

On motion of Delegate Hoogerhyde of Michigan, the telegram received from Local Grand Rapids at the banquet on Tuesday evening was ordered printed in the proceedings.

The telegram was as follows:

Grand Rapids, Mich., May 17, 1910.
J. Mahlon Barnes,
National Socialist Congress,
King's Restaurant,
Fifth Ave., between Washington and
Madison Sts., Chicago, Ill.

Local in session sends greetings. One working class political party, one industrial union, both thoroughly revolutionary, spells early victory over capitalism. Let us hew to that line.

JNO. VANHORE, Sec'y.
8:32 P. M.

DEL. LEE, for the Committee on Resolutions: This is the only subject upon which there was not a unanimous report. Upon this subject there is a minority and a majority report, proposed respectively by two and seven members of the committee.

The majority recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

ATTITUDE OF THE PARTY TOWARD LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

REPORT OF THE MAJORITY.

Resolved, That this national convention of 1910 reaffirms the attitude of the Socialist Party toward the labor-union movement as declared by the national convention of 1908, in brief as follows:

1. That the party has neither the right nor the desire to interfere in any controversies which may exist within the labor-union movement over questions of form of organization or methods of action in the industrial struggle, but trusts to the labor organizations themselves to solve these questions and to evolve in the direction of ever closer solidarity and even more effective action on the industrial field.

2. That it is the interest and the duty of the party to give moral and material support to the labor organizations in all their defensive or aggressive struggles against capitalist oppression and exploitation, for the protection and extension of the rights of the wage-workers and the betterment of their material and social condition.

The National Executive Committee is hereby instructed to cause the "Address to Organized Labor" as adopted by the convention of 1908 to be edited in so far as to bring up to date the references to specific events contained therein, and then cause it to be reprinted as a leaflet and use all proper means to give it the widest circulation among the organized working people of the United States.

ALGERNON LEE, New York, Chairman.
JOSEPH E. COHEN, Pennsylvania.
ADOLPH GERMER, Illinois.
W. B. KILLINGBECK, New Jersey.
JASPER M'LEVY, Connecticut.
ELIZABETH H. THOMAS, Wisconsin.
JOHN G. WILLERT, Ohio.

REPORT OF THE MINORITY.

Delegate Cannon of Oregon, for the minority, offered the following:

Whereas, The movement of organized labor is the natural result of the

antagonism between the interests of employers and wage-workers under the capitalist system, and is a factor to be considered in the propaganda of Socialism, it being an important as well as so often the first step in the development of class consciousness; therefore, be it

Resolved, by this congress in session assembled, That we recommend the organization of labor along industrial lines based on the recognition of the irrepressible class conflict in society, but we do not oppose labor in any form of organization in its struggle against the capitalist class while evolving along class lines to economic and political action whereby in time it will demonstrate by such intelligent action its solidarity and internationally making for its final emancipation and overthrow of wage slavery.

E. L. CANNON, Oregon
W. H. WAYNICK, Washington

Delegate Cassidy (N. Y.), seconded by Delegate Maurer (Pa.), moved the adoption of the following substitute:

CASSIDY SUBSTITUTE.

Whereas, The last International Socialist and Labor Congress, held at Stuttgart, in 1907, adopted a resolution proclaiming that—

"To emancipate the proletariat completely from the bonds of intellectual, political and economic serfdom, the political and economic struggle are alike necessary."

In other words, that such complete emancipation of the proletariat is impossible unless it is organized both economically and politically for that purpose; and

Whereas, The above Stuttgart resolution further declares that—

"The development of the capitalist system of production, the increased concentration of the means of production, the growing alliances of employers, the increasing dependence of particular trades upon the totality of bourgeois society would reduce trades unions to impotence if concerning themselves about nothing more than trade interests, they took their stand on corporate (craft) selfishness and admitted the theory of harmony of interests between labor and capital," and,

Whereas, In conformity with this resolution the Socialist Parties in practically all European countries stand decidedly on the side of and go hand in hand with true, class struggle unions and not with unions ignoring or destroying the class struggle; and,

Whereas, The above quoted description of important trades unions exactly fits the American Federation of Labor as it stands at present, and explains its impotence as a body not only to emancipate the working class but even to effectively protect the workers un-

der the capitalist system; and,

Whereas, Industrial Unionism, standing on the principle of class struggle, aiming to protect the workers in the shops *now*, and to finally secure their complete emancipation, and guided by the spirit of solidarity of workers not only of one craft, but of entire industries and of the whole working-class of America and the world, is alone able to effectively cope with the advanced conditions of American capitalism, and corresponds with the character of labor unions insisted on in the Stuttgart resolution as indispensable for the emancipation of the working class; and,

Whereas, The Socialist Party cannot be either indifferent or neutral on this momentous question without condemning itself to impotence to attain its final goal, and without betrayal of the cause of emancipation of the working class from wage-slavery; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Socialist Party, standing in the future as in the past, ready to assist the workers engaged in a struggle to improve their conditions, no matter how they are organized or whether they are organized at all, endorses Industrial Unionism as a principle and as an indispensable part of the class struggle, without endorsing any particular organization; and be it also

Resolved, That we declare it to be the duty of our agitators and of the publishers of our papers and our literature to teach our members and friends the principles of Industrial Unionism to enable them not only to make propaganda for our party and general principles of Socialism among their fellow members of whatever union, craft or otherwise they may belong to, but also to carry to them the message of *common action against common enemy* and of Industrial Unionism generally,

and thus hasten the day when our party, in its struggle with the Beast of Capitalism, will not stand any more as at present with its back unprotected or outflanked by the outposts of the Civic Federation, but will, like our sister parties in Europe, be backed by a powerful revolutionary army of Industrially organized workers, unconquerable and victorious.

DEL. CASSIDY: There has been a great deal of time wasted in what I think was a search for problems; but this problem which is of vital moment to the Socialist Party has been silently ignored.

I am of that school of Socialists who believe that industrial democracy, or the co-operative commonwealth, can never be ushered in until we have an economic organization that will back up the ballots that we cast. But from the personnel of the congress as I have sized it up, I have little hope for the adoption of this substitute which I have offered, because I take it that this congress is not a proper representation of the workers of the United States. The people who have most largely occupied the time of this congress are not working men or working women, that have come here from the working class. You will find they are doctors, and lawyers, and ex-preachers, and people of that character, who are now assuming the leadership of the working class of this country, until the working class themselves find out just what the class struggle is. In this substitute we are not asking you to endorse the I. W. W., but if you are to assume the role of the savior of the working class; if you assume to lead the working class in organizing on the political field, why in the name of God and of common sense don't you tell them to organize upon the economic field? That is the question. You are trying to evade the issue. You are trying to evade the issue so as not to offend the American Federation of Labor. I am not asking you to endorse the I. W. W. What I am asking you to endorse is industrial unionism. You have heard a lot of talk about the Stuttgart resolutions. I want to tell you that the salient points in this resolution that I have offered are taken from this document printed in three languages at the Stuttgart congress in 1907. So it seems we American Socialists are not paying

much attention to our international congresses.

Now there were comrades here who said that we ought to read up a little. I think it would have come with a great deal better grace if those comrades had not made those remarks, because I want to tell you there are a whole lot of workingmen who work twelve and fourteen hours a day who have no time for reading books. But I tell you they don't have to read books to know that there is a class struggle. They can get Socialism out of the hard facts. I learned Socialism through the hard school of experience, and I did not need Marx, or Engels, or Bebel or Liebknecht, to tell me where my material interests lie.

Let us meet this issue as Socialists; let us face it as men. Let us tell the workers of this country that they are following a false light. Look at the Federation of Labor. It is made up of two hundred crafts scattered through forty-five states, three territories, and the District of Columbia. Suppose a foreign invader landed in Boston Harbor; and the rest of the country allowed Massachusetts to fight the enemy single handed. You would say that was a hell of a Union. That is the identical position in which the labor unions of this country are today. And we, the Socialist Party, are asking the workers to participate in this sickly piece of sentimentality, this sickly burlesque. Go out like men and tell them to organize industrially, in a grand organization where everybody will stand for all the rest, one for all and all for one, and when one strikes all strike. That is my motto.

DEL. COHEN (Pa.): I do not believe there is a comrade here who does not believe absolutely, irreconcilably and irrevocably in a complete, most compact, most solidified organization of labor, both in the economic and the political fields. But how are we to get those things? That is the practical, the only question before us. What does the majority report say? That our party has neither the right nor the desire to interfere in any controversy which may exist within the labor union movement over the question of the form of the movement—

(Here a request was made that the majority report be read, which was accordingly done.)

Now, the question is this, shall we

accomplish more by letting this fight be fought out in the ranks of organized labor by the men who are making the fight there, or shall we accomplish more by passing resolutions outside of the ranks of the unions and announcing theories of the proper form of labor organization? The trial has been made many times to accomplish the result we all want from outside the ranks of organized labor unions. We tried it once; what was the result? We did not organize the unions, but we split the Socialist Party. Some other well meaning comrades started the I. W. W. Did you organize the trade union movement, into your line of action? No. You split the I. W. W. into two sections; and you did not help the Socialist Party. I say to you here and now that the industrial labor form of organization is an advanced stage, and the best form of labor organization. Let me give you an example of what this means if you adopt it. We go back to Philadelphia. We have a building trades council that is organized as an industry; and is not organized on the lines of craft autonomy at all. They do not recognize contracts. A strike of one is a strike of all. It is organized on industrial lines. It believes in political action. It believes in united political action. For what? For the Republican Party. Do you want us to go back to Philadelphia and say that that is the form of industrial unionism that we want? We who are fighting the class struggle in the trades union movement; we who are fighting for the principles of international solidarity, who are fighting inside the trades unions and who are slowly, through mistakes, perhaps, developing that condition of solidarity, we ask you to adopt the majority report and let those of us who are fighting the class struggle inside the trades unions fight this battle out for ourselves.

There is another point in this. There have been some severe remarks made here about Sam Gompers, and it is made to appear that the rank and file of the American Federation stand for the principles of Sam Gompers and stand for the Civic Federation. I deny those statements in toto. If it is true that the American Federation stands for Sam Gompers why is it that Sam Gompers was unable to deliver the vote of organized labor for William Jennings Bryan in 1908? If it is true

that the rank and file of the American Federation of Labor are the same as their officers, and that those officers express their principles, then every one who is a member of the American Federation ought to be expelled, because I am satisfied every one of you here is opposed to the Civic Federation. I ask you not to adopt these other resolutions, which only mean the injection from the outside of something that does not belong here. It will only give the reactionaries in the trades union movement whom we are fighting inside the trades union movement another lease of life, make martyrs of them, and hold back for a long time our endeavor to organize the trades unions along the lines of revolutionary Socialist principles.

DEL. BARNES (Louisiana): I am not speaking alone for the I. W. W., but I am speaking for ten millions of black people. The solution of that great race problem lies in the organization of the colored race industrially, which is the only organization they can comprehend. I have been a member of the Federation of Labor and also of the Carpenters' Union. We have tried in every way we could to organize those people into some form of union, but the only form that we have found effective in organizing them is the industrial form. And in speaking of those ten million of people I want the comrades to understand that we have there the greatest wage problem that there is in any section of the United States. It is greater than your problem in the east or your problem in the west; a thousand times greater. And if there are any solutions of that problem that you can suggest it is up to you to suggest them; it is your duty to suggest them. I don't believe the I. W. W. wants this congress to endorse it. It simply wants you to recognize the principle of industrial organization. The cause of Socialism demands that we shall adopt the industrial form of organization because that is the form that reaches down and gets the man lowest down; and we have got to get the man that is lowest down or the capitalists will use him to defeat us and defeat his own interests. Now whether it is right or wrong the white people of the south won't mix with the negroes. Men go down there for a few months and try to understand the condition of things. I have lived among those people for

forty-five years and new things come up every day. But after living in both sections, and standing impartial on this question, I believe that the industrial organization is the only solution of this tremendous problem. You cannot organize the negroes politically in the south; it would do you no good if you did. They disfranchise him. But this industrial movement will educate him; and when the white Socialists get into power, he will come in as an educated man to do his part, and will become a valuable citizen. That is why I am in favor of the industrial form of organization.

DEL. M'ALLISTER (Mo.): You say the colored man is disfranchised. Some of the comrades deny that. Will you explain that?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, no. We can't go into that. Some one to speak for the substitute next.

DEL. SCHNAIDT (Ohio): We believe that this substitute is the fairest thing presented here. Why? We who are in the American Federation of Labor and yet believe in the industrial form of organization, are there why? Because in our particular districts there are no means by which we can stand for industrial unionism as there are no such organizations. Therefore we join the American Federation of Labor hoping to accomplish more by doing so than we can accomplish outside. But we are opposed to trade autonomy because, for one reason, it has been demonstrated a thousand times that one trade will work while the other strikes. We know that is wrong and we simply want you to adopt the substitute and say just what we think is right and what we ought to stand for. The mover and author of this substitute is not a member of the I. W. W.; he belongs to the American Federation of Labor; he does not want anything to do with the I. W. W. Neither do I. I belong to a craft that recognizes American Federation of Labor. We would gladly get out of it if we possibly could. We are in a position where we cannot. But give us a chance to express ourselves in favor of the industrial form of organization. We are not asking for the indorsement of the I. W. W. We are not asking for the indorsement of the American Federation; neither are we asking for the domination of the American Federation of Labor. We simply ask for an

indorsement of the principles of industrial unionism.

DEL. UNTERMANN (Calif.): I am one of the originators of the I. W. W. I am not one of the intellectuals who has never been down in the dust, and who does not know the real condition of the working class. I hoped that when this question of industrial unionism came before the Socialist congress, it would come in such a form that the Socialist Party could endorse the principle of industrial unionism without seeming to indorse any particular organization; but now, when the substitute comes, it places me in a position where I cannot accept it, because in it there is a clause which practically condemns the American Federation of Labor. If that were not in it, I would endorse the substitute. But with that clause in it, I am compelled, although in favor of industrial unionism, to vote for the majority report. If you leave that clause in there and adopt it you place the Socialist Party in the most undesirable position it could possibly be in. The cry is raised all over the country now that there is danger of a labor union party. Think if that happened what a position you would be in if you adopted that resolution; if you said to the unionists in the American Federation that you would rather endorse the industrial form than the American Federation of Labor. What we must recognize in studying social tendencies is that the constant growth of centralization among the big corporations, the steady growth and efficiency of trusts, makes it absolutely necessary that the working men shall adopt another form of organization on the industrial field than that which for a time was very effective. The craft organization of the working class is not sufficient as a weapon to combat the widespread army of capitalistic combination and centralization, but neither is the mere industrial organization. Now there is no industrial organization in the country today that has gone clearly on record as favoring political action. When we organized the I. W. W. we hoped that it would be both a political and an economic organization, uniting on the industrial and the political field in the most efficient manner. Instead of that, from the very outset there crept in an element that made for disintegration, and today the I. W. W. has drifted back towards syndicalism. They say that

they are not for political action until the whole working class is organized industrially, and that then out of that industrial organization will come political expression. We say the political and industrial organization must now act together. And now, when the I. W. W. is in the stage of disintegration, when it is fighting the Socialist Party instead of helping it, I shall take good care not to indorse that sort of thing. Let them show that they are actually organizing the working class; let them work with Western Federation of Miners; let them work with the Socialist Party and not try to disrupt it, and then I shall have no fear of declaring plainly and positively for the industrial form of labor organization, but until then I refuse to vote for this substitute and shall vote for the majority report.

The Chairman having announced that he would recognize as far as possible speakers for the various propositions before the house in rotation, Delegate Thomas appealed from the ruling of the chair on the ground that it was not fair to the supporters of the majority report who were in the majority on the floor. On a division the ruling of the chair was sustained, by a vote of 33 to 15.

DEL. BURKE (N. H.): It looks as though a labor union party is soon to be formed; but whether it is or not it seems inevitable that there will soon be a new party in this country. That new party will probably stand for the public ownership of certain public utilities, and it will stand for various reforms and immediate demands, with a certain progressive element that is now trying to conduct the Socialist Party. When that time comes the radical elements of this country will flock to this new party. Then the Socialist Party will have to go back to the bed rock principles of international Socialism and will have to stand squarely for the class struggle.

Now I stand for the minority report because I recognize the fact that capitalism cannot be abolished without a class struggle in the economic organization. I live in the paper town of Franklin, New Hampshire. We had a strike there this spring; and it was still on when I left home. The union paper makers affiliated with the A. F. of L. were out on strike. The paper trust imported scabs and strike breakers. These men were housed in the mills; they had their food brought

to them in the mills; the militia were called out and all the usual tactics were used by the capitalistic class to break that strike, and yet the railroad employees affiliated with the A. F. of L. did not refuse to haul the paper made by the scabs, the union printers did not refuse to use the paper made by the scabs, and yet all these unions were affiliated with the A. F. of L. I am a member of the A. F. of L. But I am a member of necessity. I want to get out of it. I want this Socialist Party to take a stand for the economic organization along right lines. I don't ask for an indorsement of the I. W. W. I do want a plain statement so that our speakers can point out the proper lines of action both politically and economically. The minority report does not denounce the A. F. of L. But it does stand for the principles of industrial unionism.

DEL. MAURER (Pa.): I have been in the union movement for thirty years. I have also been a delegate to many state conventions of the American Federation of Labor, as well as to every Socialist convention in that state. I have never up to this time voted along the lines of this majority report. I wish now to explain the reasons why I favor the substitute. The Socialist Party is, of course, not a trades union movement. But the trades unionists and the unorganized workers do—and there is no doubt about it—they do look to the Socialist Party for information on these various subjects that pertain to their very existence. It is also true that we are qualified to inform them. Now this question is not brought here by the American Federation of Labor. The American Federation of Labor has no representatives here. Nor do I understand that the I. W. W. has any representative here asking us to indorse them. As I understand it, the position of the supporters of both the minority and the substitute report is that they should simply advise the working classes where we think they belong. Now, I have not found in my experience of the past two years a single progressive Socialist who is opposed to the industrial form of organization. I do not believe there are five Socialists in this congress who will deny that the industrial form of organization is the best. Now there must be a reason for the difference of opinion here, and it is this: we have not yet arrived at

that stage that we are willing to back an unpopular idea. I do not care what the American Federation of Labor thinks about my stand here. We all know that craft unionism has outlived its usefulness. There was a time when the capitalists stood as individuals; and then the craft union was all right as a weapon with which the workingmen might defend himself; but now those individual capitalists are concentrated in great combinations with one great central office, one body of executive officers, and the weapon which was all right before is becoming useless now; and when there is a strike of one craft, unless they all stand together, they are doomed to defeat, because they are beaten by other crafts. Now we Socialists are practically agreed that this is a bad thing; then why do we not stand up and tell the truth? I say we owe a duty to the working class world and we are not performing it. There is no one has less use for the I. W. W. than I have. One would think that it was a fight here between the I. W. W. and the A. F. of L. But it is not that. The substitute does not call for that. It simply tells this Socialist congress to advise the workers of the world what is the stand they should take on the economic field. They do not recommend them to join the I. W. W. I am a member of the American Federation of Labor and have been for thirty years affiliated with the craft unions. If the American Federation of Labor has ceased to be of use to the laboring classes, then it is proper that we should condemn it. I tell you the boys of the American Federation are looking for a better form of organization. Most of them are like me, they would like to be out of it, but they have to have their card so that they may support the wife and the babies. I must keep working and I can't work without my card. So I ask this congress to point the way to the true solution, the industrial organization of labor on the economic field, and vote for this substitute, which is the statement of the honest opinion of nearly every delegate here.

DEL. PREVEY (Ohio): I believe all the comrades who have spoken for the majority, the minority and the substitute reports. We as delegates to this congress want to do the very best we can for the Socialist Party as a political organization. But sometimes with the very best intentions we do

make mistakes and fall into traps. We do not realize the position, until we have done something that we hardly understand ourselves. What do you suppose would be the attitude of Sam Gompers and the Civic Federation on this proposition? They would manifestly be pleased, if we would adopt this substitute; and they would be pleased for this reason: while the substitute resolution states that they would not endorse any particular political organization, friends, you know better. If we adopt the substitute and indorse the industrial form of organization as there stated, is it not equivalent to indorsing the I. W. W.? Nobody knows that better than the I. W. W. men who hope to disrupt the Socialist Party, men who are members of Socialist locals and do nothing else but try to disrupt those locals and get the members for the I. W. W. I do not believe, mind you, that those who have supported the minority and substitute reports here have any such motive; I do not believe that is true. What do we gain for the workers by adopting the minority report or the substitute? Would the industrial form of organization immediately gain great power? Decidedly not. Would it change the condition of the men who are now in the A. F. of L.? Decidedly not. Would it help those in that organization—that organization who favor the industrial form of labor organization? Decidedly not. But it would do this, comrades; it would put those who are now in the Federation of Labor in such a position that they could not say a word about politics in that organization, because they would throw them out, and say they were there for the I. W. W. and opposed to the Federation.

DEL. THOMPSON: That is the danger.

DEL. PREVEY: That is what I want to guard against. You remember that we are now making a special propaganda movement among the unions. Comrade John Collins, who is a machinist with a union card, is going among the unions and doing good work for the Socialist Party. Do you suppose that these national organizers are going to be allowed to go into those unions and get the floor if you adopt this minority report or the substitute? As Socialists we must get a hearing. We must be heard. We are a political party; we should leave the economic organizations to

fight out their own battle, and work out their own problems; and if our philosophy is true, then there can be but one outcome of that fight. You have heard here today that many thousands and hundreds of thousands are helpless unless they join their craft unions; they have nowhere else to go. If that is so, then we must reach them by getting them within the area of our political propaganda. I say the trades unionists know their own immediate business best. I am sorry that so many Socialists know—or think they do—all about what the trades unionists should do. I was in that position for a number of years, until I had a discussion with the editor of our labor paper. I found that the trades unionist knew a lot more than I did about what he wanted, and about the conditions in his particular unions.

Now, friends, we are all agreed as students of political economy that the industrial form of organization is the best. Members of the A. F. of L. have stated that fact on this floor. The question is the attitude of the Socialist Party as a political party at this time. I say that if we adopt the minority report or the substitute, we practically shut ourselves out of the American Federation of Labor and indorse the I. W. W. And by the way, referring to that telegram sent to the Socialists at Newcastle, Pennsylvania, nobody knows better than the Socialists here from Pennsylvania that the Socialists of Newcastle had to repudiate the I. W. W.

When I returned from the last convention of the Socialist Party, I was glad to be able to read to the trades unionists of Akron what the convention had said on the trades union question. I want to be able to do it again, because we want to get those men; and we want to get the men of the I. W. W. and the men of the A. F. of L. and the unorganized workers. So don't let us make any mistake. I was opposed to indorsing the suffrage association, I am opposed to indorsing the I. W. W.—I shall vote for the majority report.

DEL. KOCHANOWICZ (Polish Sec.): I am against the majority report because the first section contradicts the second. I say it is the duty of this Socialist Party to show to the workingmen what is their duty on this question. We should say that the craft system is a bad one and the industrial system is the right one. In the first

section we read that this party has neither the right nor the desire to interfere. I would say that we do not want to interfere in any fight that may exist within the labor union movement; but we have a duty to perform in letting them see which is the right form of organization. The whole American Federation of Labor is based upon an idea of organization which was all right in the eighteenth century, but is useless in the twentieth. If we, as students of economic conditions, are agreed that the industrial form is scientific and correct, is it not our duty to point out to the workingmen the true way they should go in their fight? I do not see why we should not express our mind, express our convictions in our resolutions. I am against the majority report because it is not what we want as Socialists. I am for the minority report because it states what we want as Socialists.

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I am merely a soap box agitator. When I go upon the platform I say that labor is entitled to its full product. That is the Socialist doctrine. The A. F. of L. says it is only entitled to a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. Capitalism has developed so that competition has been eliminated practically among the men who own the tools of production. Then what is the use of craft unionism trying to get anything out of the industries of the country today which are nationally and internationally controlled? This question came up two years ago and we didn't have sand enough to take hold of it then. I hope we will now. The American Federation of Labor is going into politics. And when that time comes Sam Gompers will refuse to allow us the platforms to tell the union men that we demand for every man the full product of his labor and not a fair day's pay for a fair day's work.

What is the ultimate aim of the American Federation of Labor? I don't see any. During all this time while capitalism has been concentrating and eliminating competition among capitalists, what has the American Federation of Labor been doing? I have not seen a single progressive step. You claim to have a lot of Socialists in the American Federation of Labor. Two years ago Gompers peddled the votes—or tried to—of the members of the American Federation of Labor to the back doors of the Republican

and Democratic parties. And right after that the American Federation of Labor with its Socialists voted unanimously to make him president again; and I believe the National Secretary of this organization voted for him. You say you want to develop inside the American Federation of Labor. Have you ever pointed your finger inside the American Federation of Labor and asked why they wanted a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, when they ought to have all they produce—have you ever done that? If you have done that you have reorganized the American Federation of Labor. It is under the control of the Civic Federation fakers. It surely is, Comrade Cassidy. Comrade Cassidy said that he was willing to withdraw the clause that Comrade Untermann objected to. That does not materially strengthen the argument for the substitute. But I am tired of being told by the National Organization not to hit the American Federation of Labor. I refuse much longer to keep my hands off the American Federation of Labor that says a fair day's pay is all right, that says the wage system is all right.

A DELEGATE: What is your trade.

DEL. FURMAN: I am a dentist.

DEL. SEIDEL (Wis.): Did you ever go into a meeting of the American Federation of Labor and tell them as a Socialist that a fair day's pay was sufficient for a fair day's work?

DEL. FURMAN: I never did. I never told them that they should be satisfied with anything but the full product of their labor. We have been told here what a beautiful demonstration of solidarity they had in Philadelphia. What took place? The rank and file wanted to go on strike and the officials would not let them until the rank and file said: You get to hell out of this, and they went on strike, and the unorganized men went with them. The American Federation of Labor workmen furnished the power at the power house to run the cars for the scabs that were running them. That is the kind of organization the American Federation of Labor is. You tell me to keep my hands off them when I get up on the street corner and I am pretty near the point where I refuse to do it. Try to develop this party without a spine and you will drive the Socialists out of this movement.

A DELEGATE: Go back to the S. L. P.

DEL. FURMAN: I will never go back to the S. L. P.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Cassidy states that he is willing to strike out the clause in his resolution objected to by Comrade Untermann.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): I object, Mr. Chairman. At this hour, when many of the delegates have expressed their convictions of this matter, and it has developed that there is a strong opposition to this substitute, I must object to any modification of the wording of any of the three motions before the house.

The Chairman declared the point well taken and declined to allow the modification.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): In favor of the majority report let me say this. We are not cowards; we are not afraid to take a position. But, comrades, we must be careful builders. We are in the presence of enemies who are shrewd and unfair and adroit. They are tacticians, they are parliamentarians, and some of them are absolutely unprincipled and immoral. In the presence of such an enemy we must be careful. Now it has occurred to me that if we would do a little more thinking on some of these problems and a little less talking, we might get a little closer to the solution of our difficulties. Just for a moment run over in your mind the history of the Socialist movement in America for the past twenty years. In this minority report and in the substitute you are asked to take a step that has twice resulted disastrously in the history of the Socialist movement in America. The S. L. P. tried it and it absolutely killed the S. L. P., then the only expression of the working class in the political field. Then again the same kind of a mistake was precipitated in the I. W. W. movement. Now, I don't want to say a word against the sincerity or the honesty of those comrades who launched that movement. But it seems plain that there again a similar mistake was made. But steadily through all these years our party has maintained another attitude. It has been the attitude expressed in the majority report. That attitude has been what has placed the Socialist Party of America in the splendid position it occupies today. Let me say this: that that attitude persistently and consistently ad-

hered to has won to us in Milwaukee ninety per cent of the trades union vote. You can't win the trades union vote by passing one resolution. It takes years of steady work. Most of these union men have got to be shown. They have been told that the Socialist Party is against the trades unions. And it took a lot of persistent hard work to convince them with the men working against us in that movement that we were with them. We don't want to make any mistake about this matter. Let me remind you of another thing. The situation in European countries is very different from what it is here. The substitute quotes from the Stuttgart resolution and then tries to apply that resolution to this country. But the conditions are entirely different here. In Europe the trades union movement and the Socialist movement are practically one and the same. What we want to do here is to stand by the policies that in Milwaukee have made the relations between the trades unions and the international Socialist movement one of harmony and unity. We have done that in Milwaukee and we believe we have done it on the basis of the majority report. If you will follow that policy whole heartedly, honestly, patiently year after year, you will before long place the national movement where the movement in Milwaukee now is, so that there will be no question if there is a Socialist ticket in the field as to whether a trades unionist should vote that ticket, and every trades unionist will call that his ticket.

I am opposed to the minority report and the substitute for another reason. In Milwaukee we have had a difference of opinion in the trades union movement. We could not take sides with one side or the other. Why not do what we did in Milwaukee in this matter and say: This is the Socialist Party; we do not propose as a party to interfere in your controversies. Let them settle that in their own field; and let the Socialist Party take care of its own controversies. And it will have enough to do if it does that.

Now, I believe it is true that as a principle every intelligent member of the Socialist Party realizes that the industrial form of organization is the real form of organization that we want. But, comrades, do not forget that every Socialist in the American Federation of Labor is struggling in that or-

ganization for the industrial form of organization. You don't need to tell me to do that. We don't need to resolve to do that. Just do it. As a matter of fact we are doing it. I am a trades unionist. I was going to pull out my card to show you. But we are working; and steadily, but surely, irresistibly, the truth is gaining ground in the trades unions. If you leave us the policy that we have followed so successfully for the last five or six years, we will win the trades union movement; we will solidify it; we will bring its members into the Socialist Party; and the Socialist Party of America will go straight on to victory.

DEL. WAYNICK (Wash.): During this discussion I have been wondering what you propose to do with the vast army of workingmen who are not organized. You can't handle them very well unless they are organized.

Now, at our last convention in Washington we adopted a resolution in favor of industrial unionism, but not opposed to political action. We expressly stated that; and no one need object to that. I think that in the matter of the trade union movement Washington will measure up pretty well with all other parts of the country. I live in a town where there are something like thirty different trade unions. They did not make any objection to that. And if you will notice in this minority report there is no indorsement of anything, or any organization. It merely commends the industrial form of organization. I think, in fact, this minority report removes the objection that Comrade Untermann had to the substitute. I want to call your attention to the fact that since the Knights of Labor there has been no real effort to organize the great mass of unorganized labor. The Knights of Labor made an effort to do it and at one time I thought they would succeed. Right there I want to ask every trades unionist here what effort they have made to organize the great mass of unorganized workingmen? I know that there is nothing being done in that line in the state of Washington. You are not trying to organize the great mass of workers in the lumber industry there, or in the canneries. Perhaps it is impossible to organize this great unorganized mass. I want to call your attention again to the fact that we merely rec-

ommend the organization of the workers along the industrial line. And it seems to me that is the only way we will ever get this great unorganized mass which we must have as well as the trades unions.

DEL. CANNON (Ariz.): Most of the speakers who have supported the majority report say: We are against the American Federation of Labor, but don't let's tell anybody about it. Keep it quiet, or they will find it out. Every speaker says he favors the industrial form of organization; and they have said that the I. W. W. was an industrial organization. It was never intended to be an industrial organization. Those who defended it and worked for it knew nothing of industrial organization. That has been proven a failure. We are told by the majority report that we who have been working for the industrial form of organization—that we were mere theorists. All the theories I ever got on this subject I got from practice. I have been in labor unions; I have been in the councils of the labor organizations; and what I have seen there impels me to work for industrial organization. We are told by the comrades from Milwaukee that they have access to the unions of the A. F. of L. Perhaps they have; and then we are told by the Milwaukee comrades that they are opposing the heads of that organization. It is not many years ago that Victor L. Berger in the name of the Socialists got up in the Federation of Labor and supported the nomination of Gompers for the presidency of that organization. Do you approve of the conduct of Berger in that convention? I for one won't stand for Berger or anyone else supporting the nomination of Gompers, in the name of the Socialists of the United States.

A DELEGATE: State the circumstances.

DEL. CANNON: It was pretended that he was in danger of being sent to jail and that he ought to have united support. I want to point out the fact that since that time whenever there is an election, the United States Courts make a martyr out of Gompers—conveniently make a martyr out of Gompers—and they elect him again. At the last convention we were told that he would probably be called to Washington to go to jail before the convention closed.

And I suppose after a lot of delays

he will again be threatened with jail just about the time when the convention of the Federation is held again. They are martyrs in order to continue them in office.

Bear in mind that I stand with the Federation of Labor so far as the rank and file are concerned. I stand with the strikers in Philadelphia, with the strikers of New York, with the unorganized strikers in Bethlehem; but I do not stand for the policy of that organization as carried out by its officers. President Taft is a member of the Federation of Labor. Ex-President Roosevelt is a member or was. I don't want any of it in mine.

Let us see what will be the effect of this substitute. You are afraid of offending the great mass of workers in the Federation of Labor. You can't offend them by being radical or even ultra radical. In the brass and silver workers' organization there are forty crafts united; that is industrial unionism; the men themselves are coming to it; but you are afraid of it; afraid to speak your minds on it.

It is said that Gompers would like to have you adopt this substitute. Don't be afraid of that. Gompers is going to have his hands full.

I want to tell you again that the great mass of the American working people are ready for action, for concerted political action. We who are in the advance of the progressive labor movement have been working on that for years and our labor is not lost. The work of the soap boxers has not been lost. The energy is gaining all the time; it is being stored up and when the crisis comes it will sweep capitalism out of power. If you want to be with us then you must be with us now.

Now, comrades, for years when I have been on the soap box and I have been asked what is the position of the Socialist Party on the trades union and industrial union question I have had to apologize for it.

Here the other day Comrade Hunter said that he was surprised that after we had appointed these great intellectual men on committees that we should reject their work. He said the soap boxer came here and repudiated the work of these highly intellectual men. I want to tell you why: because the soap boxer on the street corner, in the hall, advocates the same kind of Socialism all the time.

Delegate Carey rose to the point of

order that by action of the congress it was determined to take a vote at 12:30. The chairman pointed out that reporters are entitled by the rules to fifteen minutes.

Delegate Goebel stated his motion stated a fixed hour for the vote.

Delegate Branstetter moved a reconsideration of the motion by which the time was fixed at 12:30. The motion to reconsider was lost on division.

The previous question was then moved and seconded and on a division was carried by 54 ayes, and 20 noes.

The secretary then proceeded to call the roll of delegates upon the question of the adoption of the substitute offered by Delegate Cassidy. The substitute was lost by a vote of 58 noes to 23 ayes.

ROLL CALL.

Alabama—No: C. G. Hutchisson.
 Arizona—Yes: Jos. D. Cannon.
 Arkansas—Absent: Stanley J. Clark.
 California—No: W. Carpenter, J. Stitt Wilson, Ernest Untermann, John H. Wilde. Absent: J. B. Osborne.
 Colorado—No: W. P. Collins, Mila T. Maynard.
 Connecticut—No: Ella Reeve Bloor, Jasper McLevy.
 Florida—No: C. C. Allen.
 Idaho—Yes: T. J. Coonrod.
 Illinois—Yes: T. J. Morgan. No: G. T. Fraenckel, Mrs. Simons, A. M. Lewis, G. A. Peterson, A. M. Simons. Absent: Robert Giese, A. W. Nelson.
 Indiana—Yes: S. M. Reynolds. Absent: Jas. O'Neill.
 Iowa—No: John M. Work, J. J. Jacobsen.
 Kansas—No: Kate Richards O'Hare. Absent: Geo. D. Brewer. Not voting: Caroline A. Lowe.
 Kentucky—Absent: Walter Lanfersiek.
 Louisiana—Yes: J. W. Barnes.
 Maine—Yes: Grace V. Silver.
 Maryland—Absent: W. M. Coleman.
 Massachusetts—No: James A. DeBell, James F. Carey, Harriet D'Orsay, Geo. E. Roewer, Jr.; Dan A. White. Absent: Marion Craig Wentworth.
 Michigan—Yes: J. Hoogerhyde. No: Frank Aaltonen. Absent: Henry Kummerfeld.
 Minnesota—Yes: Leo Laukki, Mrs. Esther Laukki. No: J. E. Nash. Absent: Morris Kaplan.
 Missouri—Yes: W. W. McAllister. Absent: E. T. Behrens, W. L. Garver.

Montana—No: Geo. W. McDermott.
 Nebraska—Absent: Clyde J. Wright.
 Nevada—No: W. H. Burton.
 New Hampshire—Yes: John P. Burke.

New Jersey—Yes: Frank Hubschmitt. No: Max Fackert, Geo. H. Goebel, W. B. Killingbeck.

New Mexico—Absent: C. B. Lane.
 New York—Yes: C. L. Furman, Frank Cassidy. No: Jos. Wanhope, Algernon Lee, W. W. Passage, P. Dills, Gustave Strebel. Absent: Morris Hillquit, H. Schefer.

North Dakota—Absent: Arthur Bassett.

Ohio—Yes: E. L. Schnaidt. No: E. E. Adel, W. H. Miller, Marguerite Prevey, John G. Willert, L. A. Zitt.

Oklahoma—No: Oscar Ameringer, Winnie E. Branstetter, J. T. Cumbie, G. W. Davis.

Oregon—Yes: Tom J. Lewis. No: E. L. Cannon.

Pennsylvania—Yes: Edward Moore, Jas. H. Maurer. No: Jos. E. Cohen, Fred H. Merrick, Wm. Adams. Absent: Thos. F. Kennedy, Robert B. Ringler.

Rhode Island—No: Fred Hurst.
 South Dakota—Not voting: E. Francis Atwood.

Tennessee—Yes: T. H. Haines.
 Texas—Yes: W. J. Bell, W. W. Buchanan, P. G. Zimmerman.

Utah—Absent: W. Thurston Brown.
 Washington—No: Mrs. E. D. Cory, W. H. Waynick.

West Virginia—Absent: Harold W. Houston.

Wisconsin—No: Victor L. Berger, W. R. Gaylord, Emil Siedel, Carl D. Thompson.

Wyoming—No: W. L. O'Neil, John Heckala.

Delaware—No: J. Frank Smith.
 Georgia—Absent: Paul Hochscheid.
 Mississippi—Absent: S. W. Rose.
 North Carolina—No: Rufus J. Morton.

South Carolina—Absent: A. J. Royal.
 Virginia—Yes: E. B. Slatton.
 Summary: Yeas, 23; nays, 59; absent, 25; not voting, 2.

The secretary then called the roll upon the question of adopting the minority report.

ROLL CALL.

Alabama—No: C. G. Hutchisson.
 Arizona—Yes: Jos. D. Cannon.

Arkansas—Absent: Stanley J. Clark.
 California—No: W. Carpenter, J. Stitt Wilson, Ernest Untermann, John H. Wilde. Absent: J. B. Osborne.

Colorado—No: W. P. Collins, Mila T. Maynard.

Connecticut—No: Ella Reeve Bloor, Jasper McLevy.

Florida—No: C. C. Allen.
 Idaho—Yes: T. J. Coonrod.

Illinois—Yes: T. J. Morgan, G. A. Peterson. No: G. T. Fraenckel, Mrs. Simons, A. M. Lewis, A. M. Simons. Absent: Robert Giese, A. W. Nelson.

Indiana—Yes: S. M. Reynolds. Absent: Jas. O'Neill.

Iowa—No: John M. Work, J. J. Jacobsen.

Kansas—No: Caroline A. Lowe, Kate Richards O'Hare. Absent: Geo. D. Brewer.

Kentucky—Absent: Walter Lanfersiek.

Louisiana—Yes: J. W. Barnes.

Maine—Yes: Grace V. Silver.

Maryland—Absent: W. M. Coleman.

Massachusetts—No: James A. DeBell, James F. Carey, Harriet D'Orsay, Geo. E. Roewer, Jr., Dan A. White.

Absent: Marion Craig Wentworth.
 Michigan—Yes: Frank Aaltonen, J. Hoogerhyde. Absent: Henry Kummerfeld.

Minnesota—Yes: Leo Laukki, Mrs. Esther Laukki. No: J. E. Nash. Absent: Morris Kaplan.

Missouri—No: W. W. McAllister. Absent: E. T. Behrens, W. L. Garver.

Montana—No: Geo. W. McDermott.

Nebraska—Absent: Clyde J. Wright.

Nevada—Yes: W. H. Burton.

New Hampshire—Yes: John P. Burke.

New Jersey—Yes: Geo. H. Goebel, Frank Hubschmitt. No: Max Fackert, W. B. Killingbeck.

New Mexico—Absent: C. B. Lane.

New York—Yes: C. L. Furman, Frank Cassidy. No: Jos. Wanhope, Algernon Lee, W. W. Passage, P. Dills, Gustave Strebel. Absent: Morris Hillquit, H. Schefer.

North Dakota—Absent: Arthur Bassett.

Ohio—No: E. E. Adel, W. H. Miller, E. L. Schnaidt, Marguerite Prevey, John G. Willert, L. A. Zitt.

Oklahoma—No: Oscar Ameringer, Winnie E. Branstetter, J. T. Cumbie. Absent: G. W. Davis.

Oregon—Yes: E. L. Cannon, Tom J. Lewis.

Pennsylvania—Yes: Fred H. Merrick, Edward Moore, Jas. H. Maurer. No: Jos. E. Cohen, Wm. Adams. Absent: Thos. F. Kennedy, Robert B. Ringler.

Rhode Island—No: Fred Hurst.

South Dakota—No: E. Francis Atwood.

Tennessee—Yes: T. H. Haines.

Texas—Yes: W. J. Bell, W. W. Buchanan, P. G. Zimmerman.

Utah—Absent: W. Thurston Brown.

Washington—Yes: Mrs. E. D. Cory, W. H. Waynick.

West Virginia—Absent: Harold W. Houston.

Wisconsin—No: E. H. Thomas, W. R. Gaylord, Emil Siedel, Carl D. Thompson.

Wyoming—No: W. L. O'Neil, John Heckala.

Delaware—No: J. Frank Smith.

Georgia—Absent: Paul Hochscheid.

Mississippi—Absent: S. W. Rose.

North Carolina—No: Rufus J. Morton.

South Carolina—Absent: A. J. Royal.

Virginia—Yes: E. B. Slatton.

Summary: Yeas, 29; nays, 54; absent, 26.

The vote showed 54 noes and 29 ayes. The minority report was defeated.

Delegate Goebel moved that when the convention adjourned it adjourn for one hour. Carried.

The majority report was then adopted.

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I want my vote recorded as voting against this majority report.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): I want to go on record as voting for it.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): I want to go on record as voting No on the majority report.

Adjourned until 1:30 P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Chairman Gaylord called the congress to order at 1:45 P. M.

On motion the minutes of the ses-

sion of Friday were approved, subject to correction as to attendance of individual members.

IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE.

DEL. WILSON (Calif.): I wish to make a motion that the Immigration Committee be continued by this congress. This was omitted at the conclusion of the report. I move that the Immigration Committee be continued by the congress, to make special expert scientific investigation of the whole problem of immigration in general and Asiatic immigration in particular. The reports of this committee ought to be printed as a source of information for the party, national and international.

The motion was seconded.

DEL. T. J. LEWIS (Ore.): The motion did not state when this report was to be published. I think it would be well to publish it at some specified time, at least before the next convention.

DEL. WILSON: Let me state that I have another resolution to come, that their reports shall be published at least three months before the convening of the next convention.

The motion was carried.

GOVERNMENT BY COMMISSION.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next order of business before the house is the

report of the Committee on Commission Form of Government, Comrade Jacobsen, Chairman.

DEL. JACOBSEN (Ia.): The committee has two reports. The two reports are entirely different in their scope, and we have thought it best to make a supplementary report. In the report of the committee there occur one or two serious mistakes, the word "not" being left out in both instances. I would like the delegates to make those corrections that I now mention. In the first line under subdivision 3, "Consideration of the Various Features," that line should read "It will be seen at once that many of these features are not only not objectionable." The last "not" is left out in printing. On page 3 in the third line from the top the line should read "referendum cannot be rescinded by the commission." I have made a change in the last paragraph, and I have changed it so that if the recommendation is adopted the same committee that is provided for in the recommendation will also take up the matter provided in Section 2.

The report of the committee was then read, as follows:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE COMMISSION FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR CITIES

I. EXTENT OF.

At least twelve different states have already passed laws authorizing their cities to inaugurate the Commission Form of Government. These states are: Texas, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Dakota, South Dakota, Massachusetts, California, Idaho, Tennessee, Mississippi and Oregon. The total number of cities thus far having adopted some form of commission government, number at least seventy-five.

A steady agitation is being carried on through the magazines and various capitalistic sources for the extension of the system. It is evident, therefore, that this form of municipal government is destined to be quite widely applied.

II. FEATURES OF THE COMMISSION FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

There is a great variation in the different laws pertaining to commission form of government. However, a casual study of the various state laws and the forms contained show the following characteristic features:

1. Non-partisan nominations and elections.
2. Elections at large eliminating ward representation.
3. Majority elections, provisions that allow only two contesting nominations for each office in the final election, thus compelling the majority vote for choice.
4. The recall of elected officers.
5. The initiative.
6. The referendum.
7. Popular approval required for all important measures.
8. Publicity of all business.
9. Expert accounting.
10. Civil service provisions.

III. CONSIDERATION OF THE VARIOUS FEATURES.

It will be seen at once that many of these features are not only not objectionable from the Socialist point of view, but are actually elements in the Socialist program. We cannot, therefore, indiscriminately stand against this commission form of government. Other features, however, are not only objectionable but seriously so from our standpoint. It becomes necessary, therefore, to study each feature by itself.

Furthermore, the form of the law is different in different states. Each state organization, therefore, will have to make a careful study of the law in its own state. With this in mind, we may offer the following observations in regard to the features in the law mentioned above:

1. As to the non-partisan, nominations and elections, this committee holds that they should be opposed. There seems to be a wave among the so-called reform elements throughout the country in behalf of non-partisan municipal elections and administrations. This is perfectly natural in capitalistic circles where there is no issue whatever between the existing capitalistic parties; but with us, the Socialist Party, we hold a very definite program and represent a very concrete and vital issue, and the matter is entirely different.

The Old Party voters neither understand nor appreciate the fundamental causes underlying the failures of American municipal government. The conception of the reformers that it is due to the intrusion of national politics into municipal affairs is entirely foolish. And the idea that the elimination of partisan politics from the municipality will solve the problem is equally absurd. The Socialists alone see and understand the fundamental causes of municipal misrule. They see that it lies in a general way in the capitalistic system itself. And this they seek to overthrow. This is the vital element in every municipal problem and the vital issue in every municipal campaign.

The Socialist Party, therefore, with its whole strength must insist upon its rights to keep this issue before the people at every possible point in the whole political situation. And especially is it important that the party shall be able to give its members and those who seek to support its principles an opportunity to do so.

Therefore, the Socialist Party must oppose the elimination of party designation from the ballot because it destroys the facility with which its voting power can be brought to bear in behalf of its principles. And, besides, it tends to confuse the voters and causes principles to be lost sight of and at the same time results in an advantage to those who are able by personal means and resources to obtrude themselves upon the attention of the voters.

In most of the forms of commission law both the primary and secondary elections are made non-partisan by denying the party a right to any designation. We hold that the party should be given its right to designation, at least, in the primary election.

2. ELECTION AT LARGE.

With reference to this provision this committee holds that it should be opposed. We feel that the representation by wards in the legislative body is more democratic. The ward representatives are nearer to the people in the various sections of the city and, therefore, more likely to bring into the legislative body a knowledge of the will and wish of the people. Whatever evils arise from the ward system, as at present organized, may be eliminated by redistricting or other devices. We believe that the advantages of the ward system of representation outweighs the advantages of elections at large because it allows a representation for the minority.

The committee holds that the executive and legislative functions of the city government should be separate. And we hold that a better arrangement than that proposed by the commission form would be ward representation in the council for legislative functions and the election at large for executive functions if that system seem best.

3. MAJORITY ELECTION.

It is perfectly clear that minorities should not rule. There are only two ways in which this can be avoided, either by the form of majority election provided by the commission form of government, or the Socialistic plan of pro-

portional representation. We, therefore, favor some form of proportional representation for the secondary election.

4. The Initiative, Referendum and Recall are, of course, well known Socialist principles. They constitute the most redeeming features in the commission form. However, in many cases the state laws omit one or the other of these provisions, or restrict them with certain limitations as to percentages, time limits, etc., so as to practically nullify them. These details, therefore, should be carefully provided for.

5. PUBLICITY OF BUSINESS AND EXPERT ACCOUNTING.

Several provisions are made in the several laws against secret sessions of the commission. This, of course, would also be an excellent feature. However, in some cases the very section that ostensibly provides against secret sessions is so worded as to make the very opposite possible. For example: the Iowa law reads: "All meetings of the council, either regular or special, at which any person not a city officer is admitted shall be open to the public." Obviously, therefore, this law permits of the meetings of the council to be secret. All that is required is that everyone except officers be excluded and then under the law the meeting is secret. This is a vicious feature of the law and the provision for publicity is not an essential feature of the commission law and could be provided for just as well without it.

6. In some states there are provisions in the law prohibiting the granting of franchises until they are first approved by popular vote. Furthermore, in some cases the law provides that no measure which is once decided upon by a referendum can be rescinded by the commission.

However, it would appear that these features are not essential parts of the commission form inasmuch as they are already required by the state laws in those states, and, furthermore, could without question be secured in any state without the commission form of government.

IV. OBJECTIONABLE FEATURES.

Reviewing the above paragraphs we would urge upon the Party everywhere the necessity of guarding carefully against the objectionable features in the commission form of government. Among these we would call special attention to the following:

1. In the first place there is one serious objection to the whole idea of the commission form of government;—it combines the legislative and the executive and judicial functions. These we hold should be kept distinct. The legislative function can be best performed by a representative body elected by the people, preferably from the various localities or wards which shall decide upon the policies of the government. The administrative function, however, requires a different type of service, which in its nature calls for exceptional ability and expert administration. We hold that the municipal government may be organized in such a way as to retain all of the advantages of democracy,—an elective body to perform the functions of legislation and supervision and a separate body charged with the function of administration, thus guaranteeing both democracy and efficiency.

2. The proposal that the four or five commissioners after being elected shall themselves determine which particular department of public affairs they shall take charge of seems to us particularly unwise. It would seem better to us that the candidates be selected for the various heads of departments with special reference to their qualifications for the particular service required; and that they shall be elected to these respective positions.

3. We also observe a tendency under the commission form to lengthen the tenure of office. This we view with disfavor.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

In view of the above we recommend:

1. That the various local and state organizations be urged to prepare themselves thoroughly to meet the situation created by the commission form of government of cities by appointing special committees and otherwise to study the situation and to make recommendations to their respective organizations.

We further recommend that the congress itself elect a permanent committee to further study the subject and report from time to time in the Socialist Press, and finally to the next National Convention, and in view of the fact that the public utility laws now being enacted by the various states bearing directly upon the question of municipal government, we recommend that the above committee investigate in a similar way and report upon the subject of the state public utility commissions and their bearing upon municipal government.

2. And, in view of the fact that the various primary laws also bear directly upon the matter of the commission form of government of cities, we further recommend that the committee study and report upon the primary election laws in the various states.

J. J. JACOBSEN, Chairman;
CARL D. THOMPSON, Secretary;
WINNIE E. BRANSTETTER,
JASPER M'LEVY,
S. W. ROSE,

Committee,

DEL. JACOBSEN: I move that the report of the committee be received and the recommendations concurred in. Motion seconded by Delegate DeBell.

DEL. WILSON: I believe there is a supplementary report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chairman

says he wishes to have that considered separately.

The report of the committee was then adopted.

Delegate Thompson then read the supplementary report of the committee on the Commission Form of Government, as follows:

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMISSION FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR CITIES

It was the question of what should be the attitude and tactics of the Socialist Party in cities having the commission form of government that led to the appointment of this committee in the first place. This committee, however, felt that a preliminary report covering the general question and setting forth the general features of the law must precede our report on this question. But we have no disposition to shirk the responsibility of facing the problem which the commission form of government forces upon the locals where it is in operation.

The following telegram was received by Delegate J. Stitt Wilson of California, and by him turned over to the committee:

"Question of Party attitude in cities having commission form of government should be decided. Should we voluntarily disfranchise ourselves and refrain from voting after losing out at primaries? Hope you have full information San Diego case."

Comrade Wilson also presented documents giving a statement of the case. It is typical of what has already happened in other cities and undoubtedly will happen in a great many more. So it is worthy of consideration.

In brief, the situation is as follows:

"The San Diego city charter prohibits all party action, party designations and party tickets. There are two elections—a nominating or primary election, and the election proper. To secure a place on the official primary ballot the candidate must file with the city clerk his personal verified notice of candidacy, also a petition supporting such candidacy, signed by not less than fifty electors of the city. There is no limit to the number of candidates permissible at this election. In prescribing the form of the primary ballot the charter reads as follows: 'The ballots shall have no party or other designation or mark whatever.' The election is held under the general election laws, and the returns are made and certified to by the city clerk in the usual way. These returns are officially canvassed by the Common Council and the results published in the city papers. The charter provision prescribing the form of the official final ballot, and what it shall contain, is in part as follows: 'The two candidates receiving the highest number of votes for each of the offices to be filled, except for the members

of the Common Council and Board of Education, shall be the candidates and the only candidates whose names shall be placed on the ballot for said office.' In the case of the Common Council and Board of Education, each composed of five members, the names of the ten candidates for each body, receiving the highest vote, are put on the ballot."

The case then is this.—The state constitution of the Socialist Party of California compels the party organization in every locality to put up a distinctly designated Socialist Party ticket. The state and charter laws of California under the commission form of government makes it impossible. The provisions of the state constitution are very rigid, however. It prescribes that a local's charter may be revoked, (Sec. 14, Div. c) "For nominating as a candidate any person not a member of the Socialist Party, or for supporting, aiding or failing to repudiate, and expel from the party any candidate, even though the regular nominee of the party, who shall accept any nomination, made with or without his consent, by any other political organization or party, or allow the same to stand without protest in the public press and other available means, or for neglecting to make nominations where there are members who have signified their willingness to serve."

The California constitution further declares that any member may be expelled,—(Sec. 9, Div. b and e), "For voting for, or aiding the election of any candidate on any ticket other than the Socialist Party ticket." "For voting the official primary ticket of any individual or organization other than the Socialist Party."

Here then is a party constitution only a year old and a single turn in capitalistic evolution in government puts the whole party organization out of gear, disfranchises the comrades completely, ties them up in their own party entanglement, and, worst of all, reopens at once most serious party controversies.

Clearly we must not allow ourselves to be so easily put out of the battle. And certainly we must not allow the capitalist politician to strangle us with our own constitutional limitations.

It is perfectly clear that an intelligent, aggressive working class thoroughly aroused to the issues of a fierce struggle in which they are conscious that their lives and welfare of their class is in the balance will not sit idly by nor consent to their own disfranchisement when they know they have in their own hands the power to turn the tide of battle for better conditions for themselves and the industrial masses.

Such a course would be in itself both denial and abandonment of the class struggle. And we hold that whatever be the difficulties or danger of the battle that capitalism forces upon us as a party, above all things **WE MUST NEVER FOR ONE MOMENT IN ANY CITY OR STATE ABANDON THE CLASS STRUGGLE.**

Your committee would point out that for many years our comrades of the great European countries have faced just such situations as this. Some of them have never had any other opportunity. In Germany, for example, the comrades have their candidates in the primary election. They strive hard to win a place on the second ballot. But if they fail, and they often do, they do not therefore refuse to vote in the second election. Much less do they force their comrades to disfranchise themselves.

The permission of our comrades to vote in the secondary elections, where capitalistic laws deprive us of our own candidates is, therefore, a well established tactic of international Socialism. The committee holds that our American comrades would be willing to learn from their experience and follow their example.

Your committee would further point out that our national constitution does not prevent our comrades from taking part in a secondary election from which their candidates have been eliminated, assuming that they have done their full duty to win a place for their candidates in such an election.

Furthermore, your committee would point out that this situation will pertain only to the earlier stages of the movement in each locality. As soon as the party grows strong enough to capture second place in any locality the difficulty disappears.

The committee therefore is of the opinion that:

RESOLVED, That wherever the capitalistic election laws, whether under the commission form of government or otherwise prohibit the use of party can-

didates and party designations on the ballot that our comrades be advised:—

1. To use every possible means to get their own party candidates on the ticket to maintain as completely as possible their own distinct party organization and party campaign.

2. To use every device possible under the law to make the party candidates known to the public.

3. To use their utmost energies to win a place for their distinct party candidates on the secondary election ballot.

4. And finally having done all this, if they fail to win in the primary, the Congress advises the comrades nevertheless not to abandon the struggle, but to leave their members free to vote in the second election.

5. And since the tactics of the international movement does not aim to disfranchise our comrades under complicated election laws, and since our national constitution does not impose arbitrary restrictions, the Congress, therefore, advises the state organizations to revise their constitutions so that our members shall not be disfranchised nor our locals suspended or disrupted for no other reason than for encountering new and unexpected complications arising from capitalistic election laws, such as the new commission form of government imposes.

DEL. THOMPSON: I move the adoption of the supplementary report. (Seconded.)

DEL. LONDON (Jewish Agi. Bu.): A question of personal privilege. While I was away with another delegation I understand a motion was made and carried that an Immigration Committee be appointed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will Comrade Wilson say whether it was to continue the same committee?

DEL. WILSON: That was my intention, but I am perfectly willing that a committee be elected.

DEL. LONDON: I ask that this committee be increased by two.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please talk to Comrade Wilson about that.

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): I would like to move an addition to the report.

DEL. WILDE (Cal.): Comrade Chairman and Comrades, for the first time in the congress I take the floor to speak upon a subject with which I am to some extent familiar, and that is the commission form of government in California. I just want to make a few remarks on the supplementary report that has been given here, and to show you just exactly where the party would stand in any state where the direct primary law is adopted together with the commission form of government. Fortunately for California, the comrades have discovered a loophole through which they escape the intention of the capitalistic class to place such a burden upon the party as to practically destroy it. If the primary law was such that it could not have been evaded the Socialist Party of

California would find itself in this position, that they would be to the expense of somewhere approximating \$10,000 in order to get their candidates on the ticket throughout the whole state, that is, including the counties and the congressmen as well. They would have to pay a fee aggregating \$10,000. I have made a few items here to show you what I mean. For instance, governor and seven other state officials, a fee of \$50 each, \$400; eight congressmen, \$25 each, \$200; 120 state senators and assemblymen, \$10 each, \$1,200; 570 county officials, averaging \$10 each, \$5,700. This does not include something over 200 supervisors at \$10 each, which would be \$2,000, making a total, though it does not take into consideration a number of officers that I have not named, which brings it up to a total of \$9,500.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me ask the comrade, are you speaking to the commission form of government?

DEL. WILDE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Or primary elections?

DEL. WILDE: Both. I wanted to speak to both of them in order to show what the result would be if you had a commission form of government in the cities and a primary law should be adopted in the state.

THE CHAIRMAN: Confine yourself as far as possible to the subject before the house.

DEL. WILDE: Now, if we had, as I want to point out, a commission form of government in the cities and a primary law without any loophole whatsoever, we would find ourselves in

this position: After we have gone to the expense of nominating all our candidates for the various offices throughout the state and the cities, and they failed before the primary election and we found ourselves defeated so that we could not have them placed on the ballot in the by-election, we would be at the expense of this \$10,000 and would have no candidate in the field. I simply want to make that statement so that the comrades will understand. It doesn't seem to be clear in the report.

Now, the question of adopting the supplementary report is up for consideration. I want to speak in opposition to the adoption of that report, and I want to call the comrades' attention to one part of this supplementary report. You will find it under the resolutions, and it is numbered four: "And finally, having done all this, if they fail to win in the primary, the congress advises the comrades nevertheless not to abandon the struggle, but to leave their members free to vote in the second election." I am opposed to this for the reason that it is going to breed confusion and cause controversy. I would like to point out the way that the California comrades have avoided this under the commission form of government. In Berkeley, we were defeated in the nomination election, and therefore had no place upon the election in the by-election. In order that we might show our hand in that by-election we simply wrote in the names of the candidates, and I think that this supplementary report should be so worded as to make it plain to this congress that it is not going to allow any member of the party the privilege of voting for any capitalistic candidate under the commission form of government, and that we should insert the names of the candidates who failed at the first nomination election. Therefore—

I move as an amendment that this clause be stricken out. (Seconded.)

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I would like to amend by adding Section 5. Strike out both 4 and 5. They are both of the same character.

DEL. WILDE: I accept that.

DEL. WILSON: I received a telegram, as stated, from the State of California. Our comrades have been in a difficulty, and one of the strongest locals in the State of California has been torn to shreds over this question, and barely escaped the suspension of

its charter. Now, they have wired to me as a representative from California, and consulted me before I came here with reference to this question whether our members are going to be disfranchised or not. I will ask the attention of this limited number of delegates to this question. If you read the first paragraph of this report you will see that some of the most important states of this Union will sooner or later be confronted with the question of adopting a primary law and the commission form of government, and what we already have in the State of California you are going to have at your own door. As I say, the introduction of these two new laws has caused one of the most serious internal strifes in our party in the State of California. One of the strongest locals in the state has been torn to shreds and has barely escaped with its charter on this account, opening the door for attack of every kind and description, and these comrades figured with me before I left the State, and they have wired to me to introduce this matter to the congress. I did not believe I could secure such consideration from the congress as has already been given to this subject. A full report and the whole matter opened up for our consideration, was more than I expected. The great difficulty is the question of the disfranchisement of our members under these special conditions. We have shown a remarkable ability, every time we have had a question, to go back and fall back on fundamental principles without answering the questions that we are here to settle. Now, I do not believe you are going to settle this question. It is too late in the congress to settle it. You have given me no answer. You have given California no answer. You have given no other state any answer. The committee has done its best, and I am not prepared to say that the recommendations at the close of this are just what they ought to be, but it is perfectly idle to say to our members, "We cannot help you if you are disfranchised. Stand your ground and beat time." I submit that this is a serious matter. It will cost us \$10,000 in the State of California this fall to put up a full ticket. We cannot do it, and we have had to resort to a subterfuge even to get the heads of our ticket nominated, and I am a little on the anxious seat yet about whether that subterfuge will

carry through without legal trouble. Our enemies, the capitalists, will be ready to fight, and they will see to it that that is a source of trouble to us. Now, I am not ready to say, I have not given it consideration enough to say, that these two paragraphs at the close should be retained. I cannot advise. It is too concrete a matter to give an immediate and quick decision about it. Therefore, I am simply saying that the comrades in our state and in the states of the union where this is a matter of consideration, and serious consideration, do not want glittering generalities; they want some kind of advice upon a concrete difficulty.

DEL. MORGAN: I would like to see these two paragraphs stricken out. I was half asleep when he first read them, but they were not so obscure but what I understood their meaning. It means, if we adopt them, that our comrades have the authority of the party to go out and vote for non-Socialists, capitalistic candidates. If we have members in our party that have got the voting disease so bad that they cannot wait until they can vote for Socialists, they better go and join the capitalist parties altogether. When I became a Socialist there was no opportunity to vote, and no prospect of voting. That didn't bother me. I understood that I had been a fool in voting the capitalist ticket up to that time, and it didn't bother me when I was going to have a chance to vote the Socialist ticket. I was going to stop voting for my masters, and I waited, nearly five years before I had a chance to vote. When this party was first organized the desire to vote was not as prominent as it is now. The desire was to educate the working men. When I was on the National Committee in 1877 there was a section that wanted to go into political action, and the majority of the members, being old International Workingmen's Association men, that believed in the economic movement and not in the political movement, were inclined to deny the right to go into political action. I as an English-speaking member, supposing that we could reach a greater number of persons through political agitation, I also voted to have our organization go into political action, with the advice that we went into it to educate and not to vote to elect somebody. Now, there has been a loosening of ties all around. The desire to vote,

the desire to elect somebody, is carrying our movement outside of a Socialist limitations altogether, and we are becoming a populist organization with a strong desire to get into some office. That has got to be checked. It opens the door to everything. I don't care what your trouble is in California. If you have good Socialists out there they will wait till they can vote for straight Socialist candidates. (Applause.)

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.): I have not been in the Socialist movement many years, but I see one thing I never expected to see. I have lived to see Comrade Morgan stand on the floor of a Socialist convention and defend the anarchist position, and it is at least interesting.

DEL. MORGAN: That is news to me.

DEL. SIMONS: But two years ago he stood upon the floor of our national convention and helped to put into our platform the proposition that any man who dared even to speak against political action should be forever put out of the movement. Now, he comes here with a half compliment to the old Bakunin International Workingmen's Association that did not believe in political action at all. Well, "the world do move," but some people move the wrong way. Now then, this question today of whether we are going to allow our own citizens to be disfranchised or not is something at least worthy of consideration. When the capitalist class attempt to disfranchise us we get out upon the streets and we riot, we fight, we declare that there is nothing on earth that is not justifiable in an attempt to secure the right to express our opinions as a part of the government. We have seen our comrades in Russia lay down their lives for the right to vote. We have seen our comrades in Germany demonstrate in the face of machine guns and bayonets for the right to vote, to cast their ballots. We have seen this fight go on, and now we have a proposition to do what? It is proposed that we shall, by our own action, make it possible for us to be disfranchised and not have the right to express our opinions. You tell us that voting at a second ballot is something that the International Socialists would not stand for. Why, it is a thing that is done in every country of Europe. It is a thing that is favored in every country of Europe where it is done. It is a thing that is

accepted and endorsed all over the world. I tell you, we do need some education in the Socialist movement; we need it, and we need it badly. I am not afraid to stand on the floor of this congress and tell you things that you do not like to hear. I am not afraid to stand on the floor of this congress and say that this discussion shows that a great mass of members here do not know something of the tactics of international Socialism. I do not care if they were sixteen or fourteen or ten-year-old boys and had been in the movement only two years, I would expect them to find out more about the international Socialist movement than has been expressed on this floor. This movement is growing. It has extended all over the world, and yet we are told that we ought to decide to have nothing to do with it. The only Socialist mayor that we have in the far west today, at Grand Junction, was elected under the commission form of government, under this very system of voting on the preferential ballot, which means that people vote first for their own ticket, and if that fails they may vote for some one else. I want to say that if you do what is proposed you say to the capitalists that all you have to do is to change our constitution, and put a few tricks in it so as to tie our hands. These are things that we all ought to know and study and understand, because they do not require a great deal of study. You cannot find one man in Europe that does not know these things. You cannot settle this question by an appeal to prejudice or by denunciation. I believe in the class struggle, and I believe in voting while possible and working along those lines. I believe that if the Socialist Party ever were to be disqualified entirely, then there is no question but what we would have to fight. But if we are simply to tie ourselves up in a knot, then we have nobody to blame but ourselves. And that is what we are being asked to do if we refuse to adopt these lines of tactics. Of course, the world won't go to smash if we don't. Personally, I do not expect any great, tremendous effect. As to the fellows in California, I believe it will make it possible out there in California for the Socialist Party to be hamstrung and tied. It will make it possible for the Socialist Party still to remain just

a little bit of a faction out there that stands to one side in the great class struggle and let the battle go on all around them while they beat the air and howl at the fight going on around them. But I do not want to see that if I can help it. I want to see a Socialist movement that moves intelligently and with system, improving its opportunities at every single point, working for a part of the program until we can vote for the whole proposition, until the working class can rule.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I am not in favor of striking out these last two paragraphs because I do not think that we ought to tie the hands of the comrades, but I think it ought to be explicit so that the comrades would not be compelled to vote for somebody that is not a party member, and I therefore move to amend section 4 so that it will read: "And finally, having done all this, if they fail to win in the primary, the congress advises the comrades not to abandon the struggle, but to vote for party members in the second election."

DEL. MORGAN: That is all right.

DEL. THOMPSON: But they would not be on the ballot.

DEL. MERRICK: Yes, but they can vote for them. Is it the idea to vote for somebody not in the party?

DEL. MORGAN: Sure, that is what it means.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I move this as an amendment. (Seconded.)

DEL. UNTERMANN (Calif.): It is not often that I find myself in disagreement with Comrade Simons and in agreement with Comrade Morgan, but at this particular point I am in agreement with Morgan. It is utterly misleading to say that the Socialists in Germany have a right to vote on the second ballot, and that therefore the Socialists in the United States should have that right. Because, in Germany the second ballot means that they vote for a little disintegrating party of the middle class whose interests are more proletarian than capitalistic. But in the United States voting in the second ballot means nothing else but voting for the Union Labor party or the Democratic Party or Republican Party, and to that I am utterly opposed. What we want to know in California is, if we cannot vote for the Socialist Party shall we vote for any of the other three parties who are either bogus labor parties or strictly

capitalist parties, or shall we have the privilege of writing the names of our candidates on the other ballot and defending the class struggle position by remaining true to the general attitude of the Socialist Party, "No compromise, no political dealing?"

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): I certainly think if you strike out the last two sections as they are in the supplementary report, that the first three will carry. I believe our attitude in connection with the general view that prevails with those who are observing the commission form of government will be the means of developing some method, ways or means that we will get recognition; that means to get recognition in the primaries, and not attempt to land our candidates as we would by straddling the question. To allow us to vote at the second ballots when the reform element struggle to gain control throughout the land, is only another way of confusing the working class. I want to eliminate that as much as possible. So I trust that the supplementary report will carry, with the exception of the amendment as offered, striking out sections 4 and 5.

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): I desire to offer an amendment. The supplementary report as we have it here does not put us on record as being opposed to the enactment of laws designed to prohibit the use of party emblems or the use of party candidates. So I believe there should be inserted here a clause specifically stating that we are opposed utterly to the enactment of such laws, and therefore—

I desire to move the insertion of this resolution just before this present resolution, so that it will read as follows:

"Resolved, That the Socialist Party stands opposed to the enactment of any laws designed to prohibit the use of party candidates, or party emblems." And then "Be it further Resolved," etc.

The purpose of that is that where such laws are before the legislature our comrades will then be instructed to go before the legislature and put forth every effort against the passage of such enactments. As it stands now it is not clear.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): I accept the proposition. I think every member of the committee would accept that suggestion. Isn't that so, Comrade Jacobsen?

DEL. JACOBSEN: Yes.

DEL. THOMPSON: Because that was the original purpose of the committee in every case. I think the comrades do not realize as they will if they look over the last part of the report carefully, and particularly this which we have just accepted, that we have very carefully safeguarded the party so far as fusion or confusion is concerned. We have reiterated and re-emphasized the fact that we urge the comrades everywhere to do everything they possibly can to put up a big fight to the last ditch to have their own candidate with the party designation. They are advised to do everything under the law that is possible to get their candidates on the secondary ballot. That is understood, and we want to safeguard that. We want to make every possible provision against any possible fusion or deal or compromise or anything of that sort. Now, there have been a number of suggestions of devices that might be used, like writing the name in or writing the word "Socialist" or putting on a sticker, and so on. But the trouble with those devices is this, that in some states, and particularly where the commission form of government is in operation, this action would simply destroy their ballots entirely. It would simply make them illegal and they would be thrown out and would not be counted, and you would simply lose your vote.

But to come down to this proposition, the recommendation of the committee is simply this, that you fight to the last ditch for the party designation, and all the party candidates in the primary election, and fight through the primary election for your own independent party to get your men as candidates in the secondary election. That is the first proposition. But after you have done that, then what about the secondary election if you fail? Until you get to be a second party, on this basis you will fail. Shall we then say to all our comrades that they must simply not vote at all? Now, that is the question.

DEL. MORGAN: Sure.

DELEGATES: Yes.

DEL. THOMPSON: Simply disqualify them?

DELEGATES: Sure.

DEL. THOMPSON: If that is your proposition, then I want to say that I think we are moving back to the anarchist position, absolutely to the

impossiblistic position, to stay out of the election and not vote. In a situation of that sort you are going to find it practically impossible to get your organization into operation. You will find that there will be a lot of people who are considering whether or not they are going to use the Socialist Party as the expression of their political struggle, but who are practically compelled to stand off and look on the party as an obstruction.

DEL. GOEBEL: May I ask a question?

DEL. THOMPSON: Sure.

DEL. GOEBEL: I would like to ask you this question. Do you recognize any difference between candidates that are standing for the capitalist system?

DEL. THOMPSON: Certainly I do. There is a great deal of difference. All are, of course, worse than the Socialist candidates, and we would like to have all the candidates to be comrades.

DEL. UTERMANN (Calif.): Will you permit a question?

DEL. THOMPSON: Sure.

DEL. UTERMANN: Is it not a fact that the German Socialist Party for nearly a generation did not take part in the state elections of Prussia, but only in the national elections of Germany?

DEL. THOMPSON: Yes, and it is also a fact that the same men in the early stages of the Socialist movement advocated not voting at all.

DEL. UTERMANN: And they did not.

DEL. THOMPSON: And they did not; that is a fact.

DEL. UTERMANN: That is what I wanted to know.

DEL. THOMPSON: But, comrades, that was 50 years ago.

DEL. UTERMANN: No, it was not.

DEL. THOMPSON: And no Socialist Party in the world today stands depending solely upon non-political methods, and the time is past, and especially in America, where we are going to go back and repudiate the ballot. The ballot is our weapon, and we must organize our political party. Here is the question, I understand, as to whether or not we are going to leave the people in our movement free to use the ballot at the last election, and I am in favor of letting them use it, after safeguarding it at every point.

The position of the Socialist Party is, no fusion, and no trimming. We want to avoid that, but after we have done everything we can do, then I am opposed, and I believe the party membership are going to be opposed, to unnecessary restrictions. This is a question as to whether or not we are going to give our comrades a chance to use their political power intelligently. If they cannot use it in one way they can do it in another. I want to remind you that our committee, after a number of sessions and studying the matter carefully, have brought in a unanimous report and it is here before you, and I am in favor of giving our comrades every liberty to speak on it. Under restrictions such as are provided here, we are not afraid of fusion or confusion. It seems to me our comrades are needlessly alarmed about situations of that sort. As our party grows stronger, as it grows better, as it becomes more disciplined and better educated we ought to be able to trust it. Let us be careful to guard each point as we have done in this report, and after we have done that, then let us not take a position that practically strangles us on the political field and gives the other people a chance to tie our hands.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): I want to ask the Chairman of the committee a question. He has stated that the ballot was a weapon of defense. If we use the ballot to vote for capitalist candidates, is it not also a weapon of destruction?

DEL. SIMONS: I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The debate is closed, but a point of order is in order.

DEL. SIMONS: I desire to ask the Chairman of the committee if he knows the position of the English Socialist parties on this question, both the S. D. F. and the I. L. F.

DEL. THOMPSON: No.

DEL. M'DERMOTT (Mont.): Does this mean that each individual man is to use his own judgment about voting?

DEL. THOMPSON: It is to be left to the state as an organization.

DEL. M'DERMOTT: That is the question.

The question was then put on the adoption of Delegate Merrick's substitute for section 4.

DEL. MORGAN: Section 5 was linked with number 4.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am reading Comrade Merrick's substitute as it was written. Those in favor of the adoption of the substitute for section 4 will say aye. Those opposed will say no. The noes seem to have it. The noes have it, and it is so ordered. The question now falls on the amendment or proposition to strike out sections 4 and 5.

Delegate Thompson called for a roll call. A roll call was taken, and the tellers retired to count the votes.

DEL. WILSON (Calif.): I move that the reports of the standing committees hereafter be handed to the party press and published in the National Bulletin, at least three months before our next convention meets. (Seconded.)

The motion was put and carried.

Secretary Barnes announced that the minutes of the present session would be printed and mailed to the delegates on Monday next at their home addresses.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wish to suggest that authority be given to the National Secretary to make such corrections in punctuation and further editing that may be necessary for the proper printing and publication of the constitution and proceedings of this congress, and resolutions. Is there any objection to that?

THE DELEGATES: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: It will be understood that that goes into the proceedings as being authorized.

The vote on the amendment to the supplementary report was then announced by the tellers, as follows: 48 in favor, 17 opposed, 42 absent.

THE CHAIRMAN: The vote is in favor of striking out sections 4 and 5 of the supplementary report of the Committee on the Commission Form of Government. It is carried. The question falls on the adoption of the report as amended. All those in favor will say aye. Contrary no. It is so ordered.

DEL. DE BELL (Mass.): I move that the same committee stand, with the addition of four more delegates, to study and report back two years from now.

THE CHAIRMAN: That constitutes the committee which is called for in the report, I believe.

DEL. SIMONS: I would amend that by providing that it be the com-

mittee as it stands. We are going to do it by correspondence.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the committee which is to investigate the Commission Form of Government stand as a permanent committee of this congress.

The motion was put and carried.

IN MEMORIAM.

DEL. A. M. LEWIS (Ill.): Comrade Chairman and Delegates, the matter which I present to you now will only occupy about one minute. The City of Chicago yesterday sustained the loss of one of the most ardent and faithful of our workers. He is well known to everybody in Chicago, and the delegates from other parts of the country will lose nothing by at this time making the acquaintance of his name, Comrade C. E. Kirkland, one of the old time Socialists here, always working for the party and for our principles and everything connected with social activity. And as a delegate from Illinois I move you the following:

"We, the delegates of the National Congress of the Socialist Party of the United States, express our deep regret at the death of our loyal comrade and always untiring worker, C. E. Kirkland. We extend our sympathies to the members of his bereaved family, and commend his noble example to all who wish to work effectively in the cause of the working class."

This comrade died yesterday in a hospital after having been sick and undergoing several operations. About an hour before his death he delivered an address on Socialism to the rest of the patients in the ward, which is reported by those who heard it as having been one of the best addresses on Socialism heard by those folks, or probably by a good many others. It is a testimony to the zeal of our comrade, even to the hour of his death. I therefore present this resolution to the congress.

DEL. HUBSCHMITT (N. J.): I move the adoption of the resolution.

The motion was unanimously carried.

IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE.

DEL. WILSON (Calif.): It is necessary to reconsider the motion that we have a committee on immigration. I move to reconsider the motion on the Committee on Immigration, in

order to make an election instead of continuing the present committee. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule that reconsideration is not necessary, for the reason that the motion heretofore was not to continue the present committee, but to continue the committee; the continuance of the committee as a committee, but not the present members. If there is no objection that will be the ruling of the house. We will proceed then when you are ready for the selection of that committee.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next thing in regular order is the continuation of the report of the Committee on Resolutions.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I would like to ask the Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions if there is anything important in the rest of the report that we cannot agree on.

DEL. DE BELL: I move to endorse the action of the Resolution Committee as a whole.

THE CHAIRMAN: Without reporting?

DEL. DE BELL: Yes. Manifestations of dissent were made by several delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN: That motion is out of order.

SEC. BARNES: I would like information from the Chairman of the Resolution Committee how long, in his judgment, it would take to make the report.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): We have eleven resolutions which we report favorably; and I do not think any one of them is contentious. We have a considerable number which we report unfavorably, and it will depend on the movers of those resolutions whether they think it advisable to bring them up for discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will consider a motion to the effect that the resolutions reported unanimously unfavorably by the committee shall not be reported to the congress. Do I hear a second?

The motion was seconded.
THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the resolutions which the committee does not recommend

unanimously shall not be reported to the congress.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I move that they be printed in the record.

THE CHAIRMAN: As unfavorably reported?

DEL. MORGAN: Yes, just as the committee reports them, as unfavorably reported.

THE CHAIRMAN: Only those unfavorably reported?

DEL. MORGAN: Yes.
The motion was put and carried.

DEL. LEE, reporting on behalf of the committee: With the exception of the Labor Union resolution the report is unanimous, either unanimously favorable or unanimously unfavorable.

The following resolution was read: "Resolved, That this congress congratulates Comrade Fred Warren of the Appeal to Reason upon the splendid fight he has made for the preservation of the working class press, and expresses the fullest hope that the struggle in which he is engaged may come to a successful termination."

On motion the resolution was adopted.

The following resolution was read:

FREE PRESS FIGHT.

"Whereas, The struggle in New Castle has culminated in the issuance of an injunction against a thousand of the employes of the steel trust out on strike, and in the attempt to discredit the officials of the city elected by the Socialist Party and to crush the organ of the party, the 'Free Press,' by fining and imprisoning its editors; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the congress of the Socialist Party of America call upon the members of the Party everywhere to rally to the support of our comrades in Newcastle, Pa., by contributing as liberally as possible to their defense fund."

The resolution was adopted.
The following resolution, offered by Delegate O'Hare of Kansas, was read:

WHITE SLAVE TRAFFIC.

Whereas, By the recent exposures of the press and governmental reports the public mind is at this time much aroused over the white slave traffic, and since the Socialist Party offers the only solution to this problem, be it

Resolved, 1. That it is the sense of this congress that organizers, lecturers

and the press of the Socialist Party should give careful attention to this subject, always laying stress upon the economic cause of prostitution and the white slave traffic.

2. That we request the Woman's Committee to have prepared for distribution suitable literature on the subject.

The resolution was adopted.
The following resolution was read:

SOCIALIST PLATE MATTER.

That the National office furnish the labor papers free with plate service presenting the Socialist position to the trade union papers for the purpose of offsetting the anti-Socialist articles furnished to the labor press by the civic federation and other organizations.

DEL. SIMONS: A point of information. Make it mandatory that they shall send this out, because I know from our own individual experience that we have found that it did not work, that is all.

The resolution was adopted.

The following resolution was read:

That the National Executive Committee be directed to publish periodically propaganda booklets, tracts and leaflets on the general subject of the aims and methods of the Socialist movement, as well as upon special phases of the latter, notably its bearing upon the struggles of labor and other progressive social movements, and upon the most important events and conditions arising in the industrial, political and social life of the country. Such booklets, tracts and leaflets, as well as all other literature on Socialism, to be handled by the National Literature Bureau; and to be sold to the local and state organizations as nearly as possible at cost. The National Secretary shall be authorized to place the work of the Literature Bureau in charge of a special assistant who shall give his whole time to the work.

The resolution was adopted.

DEL. LEE: The next is a resolution from New York in connection with the same subject of literature. This would go as a recommendation of the congress only:

"Resolved, That the party should pay greater attention than heretofore to the sale and circulation of appropriate

Socialist propaganda literature, and that the state and local organizations of the party throughout the country be advised to employ comrades at a minimum guaranteed wage to engage in the sale of such literature in their respective localities as a regular occupation."

The resolution was adopted.

The following resolution was read:

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

The congress strongly advises all state and local organizations of the party to give careful study to the subject of workmen's compensation laws, to train a corps of speakers and writers qualified to deal with the subject, and to inaugurate a systematic and persistent campaign for the enactment of such laws and for their improvement in any cases where they may be enacted in an unsatisfactory form.

The congress instructs the National Executive Committee to assume the duty of correlating the efforts of the various state and local organizations on this line, assisting them in the collection and exchange of information, the training of speakers and writers, the publication and distribution of literature, so as to give the movement a nation-wide scope.

The congress invites the labor unions of all trades and industries to join with the party in the prosecution of this work, and urges the party organizations in every industrial center to enter into conference with the local central labor bodies for that purpose.

It was moved and seconded that the resolution be adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: If the Chairman may be permitted to state, this is especially necessary to be done through our national office, in view of the fact that there is a national wage movement to secure compensation laws especially favorable to the laborers.

The motion was put and the resolution was adopted.

The following resolution was read:

INDUSTRIAL TRAINING.

"Resolved, That a committee on education, consisting of five members, shall be appointed by the National Executive Committee, for the purpose of investigating the subject of the introduction of industrial, trade, or vocational training in the public schools of

the various states, and to ascertain its relation to the welfare of the working-class; the committee shall gather all possible information and data on the subject, and shall, from time to time, publish such data and information, and shall make such recommendations to the next National Convention as they may deem necessary and advisable for action by the Socialist Party."

On motion the resolution was adopted.

The following resolution was read:

MEXICO AND LATIN-AMERICAN COUNTRIES.

"Resolved, That we, the members of the Socialist Party of the United States, demand that the government of this country shall not interfere in the affairs of Mexico and other Latin-American countries. That we are unalterably opposed to the powers of this nation being used to buttress any foreign despotism."

DEL. LEE: The committee reports unanimously favorably upon this resolution. I believe our Comrade DeLara of Mexico, or late of Mexico, would like to address a word now to this congress upon the subject, and I believe we would be glad to have you give a little time for that purpose, if the congress feels that it can.

DEL. A. M. LEWIS (III.): I move that Comrade De Lara be given thirty minutes.

At the suggestion of delegates the time was reduced to twenty-five minutes. A motion was made to lay on the table, but was not pressed, and Comrade De Lara was given twenty-five minutes, and spoke as follows:

COMRADE L. GUITERREZ DE LARA: It is the great happiness of my life to be before you, comrades. I come here in the name of seventy-five millions of workmen; seventy-five millions that for more than one hundred years have carried on the most tremendous struggle for freedom ever known in the history of the world. You do not know that, and that is why I come here to tell you. You comrades, you know very much about American capitalism in Mexico; many of you have told me of your great hopes that Mexico would be annexed to the United States. All right. You know things that concern the capitalist class, but you do not know what concerns the Latin-American working

class, and I come to tell you their troubles.

For 100 years the working class, the proletariat of the Latin-American countries—not the middle class, but the proletariat of the Latin-American countries—have carried on the most tremendous struggle for their emancipation. Spain for 300 years ruled Latin-America, and with the class of Spain was the class of the Catholic Church, and I am going to talk about the Catholic Church as a capitalist corporation. The Kings of Spain came in Latin-America, and the land owners of Spain, and for 300 years they have been increasing their property, their land, until 100 years ago the struggle with the opponents of Spain was nothing else than a struggle of the proletariat of Latin-America in order to take away from the Catholic Church the lands that they were needing. After 300 years of Spanish rule Spain furnished to the Catholic Church the executive force of soldiers and the government. When Spain is defeated in Latin-America the Catholic Church can have no more hope, can have no more executive help from the army of Spain or the military force of Spain. Then what did the Catholic Church do? Simply go to France and England for the last hundred years. That is why we have in the Latin-American countries revolutions that are nothing else but the rebellion of the proletariat against the soldiery and against the Catholic Church by the Latin-American countries. Those revolutions that you despise so much, those revolutions have been suppressed not only by means of the soldiery and the Catholic Church, but by foreign intervention carried on by France and England in the last century. At last the Latin-American countries were not strong enough to stop this intervention of France and England. The Monroe doctrine of the United States was proclaimed. But do you know that the respectability of a people is not in black and white on paper? The respectability of a people is shown in its struggles, in the shedding of blood, not by what is written on paper.

The proletarians of the Latin-American countries have conquered some freedom for themselves in their tremendous struggles, and when they have stopped European intervention, now appears the intervention of the United States, an intervention that is

nothing else but an attempt to suppress the revolt of the proletariat. If you will read the history of the Mexican proletariat you will see that they rose against the ruling class in Mexico, and when the proletariat had conquered their emancipation the French army came to Mexico to crush down that emancipation, and when the proletariat was crushed by the tremendous war with France, then came the soldiery and the military despotism of today. And now when the proletariat again has got ready to revolt, the United States is supporting that despotism. But the masses of the people in the United States begin to see the real situation. The American masters know that the people of this country would oppose a policy that would mean a great amount of bloodshed, and that is why the American government has not dared to send soldiers down to Mexico to enforce despotism in Mexico, because the masters here are afraid of the masses, and the master class cannot so easily fool the masses and get them to murder each other. Then what do they do? The Mexican despot began to realize that the great interest of the United States was in the Catholic Church; the despots of Mexico know that, and by a combination with Mr. Roosevelt and by his permission the Mexican people are to pay two million dollars at once to the Catholic Church of California and \$40,000 a year for the time to come. And since the time that combination was made, Mr. Roosevelt has been very popular with the Catholics in the United States and the Catholics in the United States are his greatest supporters. That is the reason the American government is persecuting the Mexican refugees; not because of American capital in Mexico. The American capitalist in Mexico does not rule the same as the capitalist class here. The real reason for the attitude of the United States is nothing else but the friendship of the Catholic Church. In the small republic of Nicaragua, with half a million population, the Catholic Church was vanquished very many years ago. The same Catholic Church organized another political party and has started a revolutionary movement against Zelaya. The Catholic party started that revolution, and everybody knows that the revolution has been carried on in that country with American money, and Amer-

ican emissaries have gone to Nicaragua to give moral support to that Catholic Church revolution. In six months more than 3,000 working men have fallen in that revolution, and this government is doing nothing in order to stop that destruction of the working class.

Comrades, my time is too short to explain to you more than that. But at least I will tell you that in the Latin-American countries the Socialist movement is growing. In the Argentine Republic, in Chili, in Ecuador, in Peru and Brazil, the Socialist movement is growing, and maybe in some places like Argentine and Brazil it is growing as rapidly as in the United States. From Mexico day before yesterday I got a letter in which I am told that two weeks ago the Clerks' Associations all over the country on the first of May paraded in the streets in about half a dozen of the largest cities of the country; they paraded the streets singing the Marseillaise and shouting for Socialism.

But, comrades, the Socialist principles, the principles advocated by the working class, are against the soldiery, against intervention, against anything that causes the destruction of lives or reduces the economic condition of the working people. It is your duty to oppose any intervention by the American government in the Latin-American countries, because that intervention means nothing else but the crushing down the revolt of the proletariat. And now the despots in those Latin-American countries understand that the people, the proletariat, have no other way to get rid of despotism but by way of revolt. If the proletariat revolt the American government will interfere and subject them to a more brutal despotism than the despotism that they suffer from. That is why the proletariat in Mexico, who have the traditions of hundreds of years of struggle in order to build up that nationality, is not willing to be enslaved, to be exploited, to be murdered, and that is why they want to preserve the nationality that they have built up and secure their future emancipation. When the despots of Mexico, like other despots, are told by the proletariat that the only way to get rid of their rule is by a revolt, the American government will interfere, and then we, the proletarians will suffer.

Now, comrades, I believe it is your

duty to give us the moral help that we need. You must speak to the government here by rising and protesting; you must do everything possible in order to make the master class understand that you are against any interference that will mean the support of despotism in the Latin-American countries. Don't you know, comrades, that today the master class are building everywhere large buildings in order to give shelter to international and foreign peace societies? The masters, aye, even the Czar of Russia, talk a good deal against war. But do you know why? Not because they are such good people. Not because they believe in the doctrine of human brotherhood, but because they realize that the masses are no longer so likely to fight and butcher each other. It is not simply because they want to become leaders of men, and to say, "We are the great ones, we are the good ones." If the masses do not destroy each other, it is because we do not allow them to do so. So, comrades, you are in these conditions and realize and understand them. Last week in Chicago and in Washington there was a movement started in order to give a church one of those international peace houses. We do not need that kind of peace. Let them give it to the proletariat in Mexico, the peace that has been refused them by the master class. We do not want favor from the master class. You want to establish the principle of solidarity, and to fight with us for human happiness and for the solidarity of the working class. We do not want favors, because those favors can be taken away from the people when the master class pleases to do so. We want the real solidarity of justice, of duty, of obligation, that is the solidarity of the working class, in order to have in the time to come the emancipation of the whole working class of the world. I thank you very much. (Applause.)

Thereupon on motion of Delegate A. M. Lewis the resolution was adopted.

The committee next submitted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the National Executive Committee be instructed to give its public approval to the manifesto issued by the International Socialist Bureau on behalf of the struggling Finnish people against the aggressions of the Russian autocracy."

On motion the resolution was adopted.

The following resolution, submitted to the committee by Delegate Gaylord of Wisconsin, was read:

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM.

"Resolved, That a Committee on Congressional Program to consist of nine (9) members be chosen by the N. E. C. to report a program for the year's congressional campaign, the same to be submitted to the party referendum. The program shall state, among other matters, the attitude of the party nationally relative to the subjects of Unemployment, Industrial Compensation, Conservation, Hunger Tariff, International Peace and Judicial Usurpation."

On motion the resolution was adopted.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): As I understand, the National Executive Committee is to select this committee, but the names are to be submitted to referendum?

DEL. GAYLORD: No.

DEL. LEE: No, the report is to be submitted.

On motion the resolution was adopted.

The next resolution, submitted by Delegates Furman and Passage of New York, was read:

ON DEPORTATION.

"Resolved, That the Socialist Party declares its condemnation of the abusive methods employed by the United States Government in keeping out and deporting immigrants who come to this country."

On motion the resolution was adopted.

DEL. LEE: The following resolution was introduced by Delegates Royal of South Carolina, Morton of North Carolina, Barnes of Louisiana, Lanfersiek of Kentucky, Slatton of Virginia, Haines of Tennessee, and Rose of Mississippi:

"The undersigned, composing all the delegates from the section of the country south of the Ohio River, represent to this congress that it should be the policy of the national organization to constantly hold up the hands of the organizations of the weaker states and make special effort to organize the unorganized states, among which many of the southern states are included."

DEL. LEE: The committee recommends that this be the sense of the congress, and so moves.

The motion was seconded, and carried, and the resolution adopted.

The following resolution was read:

FOREIGN SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS.

"Whereas, The foreign speaking organizations are under the burden of special expense for their special propaganda; and

"Whereas, It is particularly desirable that the foreign speaking population of these states shall become an integral part of the political action of the Socialist Party in America; and

"Whereas, The state is the unit of political action in the United States; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this congress recommend strongly to all respective state organizations that they grant charters to locals and branches of foreign speaking organizations, on conditions which shall return to the latter fifty per cent of the state and local dues; and be it further

"Resolved, That our foreign speaking comrades are reminded that the Socialist Party of America exists for the purpose of furnishing a political weapon to the working class of America; and that they are therefore under the necessity, as Socialists, of joining and co-operating with their state and local organizations."

FOREIGN SPEAKING BRANCHES.

"Resolved, That all foreign speaking organizations be permitted to organize branches whenever and wherever they can do so within the limits of the constitution of the Socialist Party, and that the secretaries of the respective states and the locals be called upon to act according to the will and the spirit of this resolution."

On motion the resolution was adopted.

DEL. LEE: The next resolution was introduced by Del. Frank Aaltonen of Michigan:

"Resolved, That we, the Congress of the Socialist Party, request the Executive Committee of the Socialist Party and also the Executive Committee of Local Cook County together to take into their consideration the possibility of building a labor temple in the City

of Chicago for the use of American Socialists."

DEL. LEE: I will say that I understand that the Finnish organization own certain land in the City of Chicago, and that they considered that it might be advisable to build such a labor temple. Now, understand, this does not even commit the congress in any general way in favor of a certain plan, but simply asks the Executive Committee to consider whether it is feasible. In that sense the committee moves that it be adopted.

The motion was seconded.

Delegate Cassidy of New York moved to lay the resolution on the table, but the motion was lost.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I have very great doubt as to whether it would be wise for this convention or congress to adopt that. The scheme is to secure the money by selling stock. Possibly after the stock has been sold, then they will sell bonds. There has been so much of that kind of thing. So far as I am concerned I am sick of it, and I am going to do what I can to expose it, and I think it is a dangerous thing, until the comrades know to what extent this matter has gone through the party, to inaugurate it by this resolution. If our foreign comrades can get their building up down in Pullman, in the neighborhood where I live, where the people know what is being done, well and good. But to work the whole party until it is endorsed by our local organization here, I think it is dangerous, and it ought not to be passed through this congress, because it will be used—

DEL. THOMPSON: I do not always agree with Comrade Morgan, but in this case I agree.

DEL. MORGAN: Oh, you will all come my way after awhile.

DEL. AALTONEN: The reason we moved this resolution to this congress was, that the Finnish comrades in the City of Chicago have somewhere about 150 or 200 members. A while ago they bought a lot here, and they are going to build a hall or temple in this town. Now, what is the use of dividing the movement all the while? What is the use of having a Finnish building on one corner, and a Polish or Italian or English on another? Why not all get together and build one temple for this town? (Applause.) Why not build a temple which will have a hall for all the So-

cialists in the United States, regardless of their nationality? We have many little locals all over this country that have halls worth twenty, thirty, forty or fifty thousand dollars. Why can't we do the same thing that they can? There are something like 50,000 Socialists, I understand. If they were to take \$10 apiece that would bring half a million dollars. That is not so hard. In the town where I come from we are going to build a \$20,000 hall. We have something about eighty members in the local. Each member of the party gives at least \$50 or more, some as high as \$100, into the present building. Therefore, if the Finnish find it very good, the English comrades in this city should take some steps in that way so that the American Socialists here will have their own hall some time in the future. They don't want to build it now, but they do in the future. That is the reason I introduced this resolution.

On motion the resolution was then adopted.

NOMINATION OF IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN: To save time, and with the consent of the congress, the chair will appoint a nominating committee to nominate the Committee on Immigration. Is there any objection to that procedure?

No objection was heard.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: I move that the nominating committee be instructed to bring in at least seven names.

DEL. A. M. LEWIS: I move to make it fourteen names.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you accept the amendment, Del. Simons?

DEL. SIMONS: I will accept it. The motion was seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will appoint as the nominating committee Delegates Simons, Aaltonen and Thomas.

Delegate Lee of the Resolutions Committee stated that two communications had been received from Local Honolulu and local union number 306, Carpenters and Joiners' Brotherhood, New York, and moved that the Secretary be authorized to send suitable letters of response.

The motion was seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The ruling of the house concerning resolutions unfavorably reported was that they were not to be read, but were to be published in full in the minutes of the congress. Are there any others?

DEL. LEE: There are no resolutions reported favorably. All the others are reported unfavorably or were not within our province to deal with, and those were sent to other committees.

The following resolution of thanks was submitted and read, and on motion was adopted.

"Resolved, That the National Congress expresses its appreciation of the services rendered to it by its Secretary and assistant secretaries, its stenographers, the reading clerk, the National Secretary and his assistants, who have labored long and hard to aid and facilitate its work."

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): Before the chairman of the Committee on Resolutions leaves the platform I want to ask him if among these resolutions that were acted upon unfavorably, are there any the publishing of which would cause controversy?

DEL. LEE: Yes, I suppose there are.

DEL. GOEBEL: I would like to hear the titles of the resolutions read, in that event. I do not want to start a controversy, but I do not want anything in the minutes that would reflect on any official or anybody else connected with this movement, without it being heard right here.

DEL. MORGAN: If the titles are read and they cause discussion, then I shall ask that the entire resolution be read and let us know the entire wording.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I think that Comrade Goebel's point is well taken. I should not want any one to make charges that anything had not been properly presented, and I think the titles could be gone over quickly.

DEL. LEE: I can assure you that there are three or four which would probably involve some discussion, and possibly recrimination. There is one by Comrade Morgan of Illinois, dealing with the question of party papers and a demand for semi-annual financial reports from such papers. There is one from Comrade Morgan of Illinois about the exact sense of which the committee itself was not altogether clear, but which upon some interpretation it was thought might be conten-

tions, and in any case it was reported unfavorably, with regard to any compromise or alliance of party members or party organizations that do not proclaim a demand for the abolition of the economic relation of master and servant as the fundamental demand of every organization, etc. There is one by Comrade Reynolds of Indiana, reciting a number of whereases and providing for the inauguration of a special propaganda in the army and navy. There is one by Delegates Furman and Passage of New York, introduced at the request of Kings County Local, proposing to censure the National Executive Committee for its alleged neglect in the matter of the Spokane free speech fight. And there is, I think, one further.

DEL. MORGAN: There is another from Morgan, you will find.

DEL. LEE: Yes, that is what I was looking for, one of your resolutions that was contentious. There is another by Comrade Morgan of Illinois dealing with the question of the Wilshire gold mining stock scheme.

DEL. MORGAN: Pardon me. Going a little further and recalling the action of the National Executive Committee three years ago. I want it repudiated.

DEL. LEE: Referring to the action of the Executive Committee three years ago with reference to that same matter. Those, I believe, are the only unfavorably reported resolutions which would be contentious.

DEL. MERRICK: I presented a matter on Monday afternoon to the committee, and I would simply like to know if it is going to be printed, in regard to the use of the police. It was not read.

DEL. LEE: That was one of them, and I did not read it because it was regarded as contentious.

DEL. MERRICK: Is it among the resolutions?

DEL. LEE: It is, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a motion made with reference to these which are acknowledged to be contentious resolutions?

DEL. A. M. LEWIS: I move that they go to print.

Motion seconded and carried.
DEL. LEE: That completes the report of the Committee on Resolutions. The following were the resolutions reported unfavorably, but ordered printed in the proceedings:

Resolved, That this Congress recommend that Socialist plate matter be prepared and supplied free to local papers willing to publish the same, and urge state organizations and comrades everywhere to make earnest efforts to secure its introduction wherever possible.

Introduced by J. E. Nash, Minnesota. To the National Congress:

Whereas, Certain Socialist papers are supported by the official indorsement of the party and are thereby able to sell their stocks and bonds and obtain subscriptions, loans and donations from party members; and

Whereas, This official connection renders the party morally responsible for the safety of several hundred thousand dollars obtained by these papers from comrades in the sale of stocks, bonds, loans and donations; therefore,

Resolved, That it is the duty of each of these papers to furnish the party with semi-annual statements of their financial and business condition prepared by independent professional accountants and the same be published as standing matter in each of such papers so all comrades may know the facts and act upon them.

(Signed) THOMAS J. MORGAN,
Delegate Illinois.

RESOLUTION.

Whereas, The Socialist movement is absolutely separated from all other movements by its fundamental demand for the abolition of the economic relation of master and servant, which, with its wage-system and competitive struggle for work, equals in inhumanity the preceding systems of slavery and serfdom; and

Whereas, the Socialist Party is a product of the Socialist movement and by the fundamental demand for the abolition of the economic relation of master and servant is absolutely separated from all other parties and organizations which do not make this demand their fundamental declaration and purpose; and

Whereas, the desire for immediate success as measured in its increased membership, increased vote and election of its candidates, tends to obscure this fundamental, a tendency encouraged by reactionary elements, both within and without the organization which presents and advocates more popular demands; therefore,

Resolved, That this congress, recognizing this demand for the abolition of the economic relation of master and servant as the fundamental demand of the Socialist movement and its creation of the Socialist Party as a political means of enforcing this demand, therefore, this congress declares that any compromise or alliance of party members or party organizations that do not proclaim this fundamental demand as their aim and object will be held to be a violation of party principles, and that the subordination of this demand to more popular opportunistic objects is more insidious and dangerous to the party than any open compromise or alliance can be.

(Signed) THOMAS J. MORGAN,
Delegate Illinois.

Whereas, Capitalism keeps the working class in subjection through force and through fraud; and

Whereas, With the spread of Socialist philosophy and revolutionary ideals which are rapidly permeating the American people, it becomes and will become increasingly difficult to deceive the masses, or to practice frauds successfully at the polls; and

Whereas, Capitalism is already turning to its last weapon and mainstay to check the rising revolutionary tide, namely, violent suppression by the army and militia; and

Whereas, It has been made exceptionally difficult to weaken the strong right arm of plutocracy by impregnating the army and the militia with Socialism; therefore, be it

Resolved, That we recognize the tremendous importance and the present necessity of making the rank and file of the army and militia conscious of their relationship to the people whom they are pledged to defend, and whose rights they are to guard.

Resolved, That we hereby authorize and direct our National Executive Committee to take action for the focusing and concentrating of specialized determined educational propaganda for Socialism by literature, correspondence and other educational methods among the privates of the army and navy over the entire country and its colonies.

Fraternally submitted,

S. M. REYNOLDS, Indiana.

Resolved, That the delegates present censure the National Executive Committee for their neglect to give support to the free speech fight in Spo-

kane, and we demand that on similar occasions in the future they shall unequivocally give their support to all movements of the working class for the right of free speech, free assemblage and a free press.

By instructions of Local Kings County, New York.

C. L. FURMAN,
W. W. PASSAGE,
Delegates.

RESOLUTION.

Whereas, The National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party at its meeting March, 1907, in response to a protest of Local St. Louis against Wilshire stock gambling game in the Socialist Party, declared it reprehensible and detrimental to the interests of the Socialist movement to use Socialist publications for the promotion of such "enterprises;" and

Whereas, Since this official condemnation three years ago, the stock gambling game in the party has increased to such an extent as to demand action by which the party may be purged of all the corruption inseparable from this most despicable of all capitalistic schemes; therefore,

Resolved, That this congress recommend that the National Committee be requested to exclude from the Official List of Socialist papers all publications published by persons engaged in selling stocks and bonds in mining, oil and all other speculative enterprises; that every national officer and representative engaged or participating in such publications and such speculative enterprises be removed from all official and representative positions, and their names can no longer be used to lure comrades to financial ruin; that the state organizations be requested to take the same action in the election of local and state officials and representatives.

(Signed) T. J. MORGAN.

RESOLUTION.

Resolved, That the time has arrived when all Socialists and their friends should grasp from capitalism the furthestmost farthing obtainable for the building up of their own cause, and that is the voice of the present conference of the Socialist Party; that the National Committee should at once issue for the use of Socialists and their friends red trading cards representing

\$10.00, \$20.00 or \$25.00 of trade. That everywhere there are Socialists that they be requested to use these cards by calling upon their merchants and asking what percentage they will allow off for cash trade; that such merchants as will allow a discount be required to buy a punch to punch out the figures on the card representing the cash paid to said merchants by their Socialist customers. That said cards always be kept in stock by the Secretary of the Local.

That one-fourth of the amount received through the use of these cards go to the National Committee.

That one-half of the amount received through the discounts obtained through the use of these cards go to the Local selling them.

That in unorganized states one-half received from use of these cards go to National Committee and one-half to the Local selling them.

(Signed) S. W. ROSE.

Whereas, That quondam friend of the laboring class, William R. Hearst, who is either directly or indirectly interested in the Homestake mines of South Dakota, where union labor has been locked out for the past six months, for no other reason than that these men of labor refused to surrender their ethical, moral and industrial right to belong to the economic organization of their class for the purpose of protecting and advancing their personal, family and class interests, to which during election and campaign times the aforesaid Wm. R. Hearst ostensibly is very friendly; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Socialist Party of America in convention assembled endorse the resolutions of protest against the Homestake Mining Company which have been adopted by the various labor unions and approve of the boycott laid upon the Hearst publications by these organizations, and advise the workers of America to cease their support of these papers while the owners occupy such a position of antagonism to the interests of labor.

JOS. D. CANNON,
S. M. REYNOLDS,
ADOLPH GERMER,
W. B. KILLINGBECK,
E. L. CANNON, Oregon.

RESOLUTION ON "WORK FOR ALL."

The Socialist Party proclaims that among the duties of government is provision to employ all willing workers displaced by economic development and surplus values in the capitalistic system. And as a financial means to that end we stand for "centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly."

We further declare that the constitutional requirements for carrying out such propositions are embodied in Article 1, section 8, of the United States Constitution, which reads that congress "shall have power to coin money and regulate the value thereof." given ample power the Socialist Party will secure for such willing workers opportunities to earn an honest living.

(Signed) FRED HURST.

Whereas, This country is no longer a republic, but a capitalistic oligarchy.

Whereas, Capitalistic oppression and exploitation are driving the people to revolt.

Whereas, The constitutional safeguards of free speech, assemblage, suffrage, nomination and election of officials have through intimidation, fraud, graft and corruption by capitalism been turned into most formidable weapons for the enslavement of the people.

Whereas, Therefore, under the present form of government there exists no hope of relief except through a violent revolution; therefore, be it

Resolved, By this National Congress of the Socialist Party of the United States that we appeal to the whole people on strength of the constitution, Declaration of Independence and bill of rights in the courts of the various states to join us in a mighty combined effort to overthrow capitalism and institute a new form of government which shall insure justice and equity for all.

ALEX GUSTAFSEN.

COMMITTEE ON LITERATURE.

Suggestion that the National Office conduct the Literature Bureau on a larger scale, printing or reprinting pamphlets and books and selling them to locals at cost.

Comment: At the present time the crying need of the country is for systematic distribution of literature.

The National Office has undertaken the work of supplying leaflets, but for the most part the printing of books and pamphlets is in the hands of private individuals, who are not in a position to furnish them at cost.

The National Office not being so situated should publish books and pamphlets and sell them at cost. The cheaper these things are sold the more there will be distributed. The element of profit should not militate against the distribution of Socialist literature.

There are many comrades who are willing to spend money for pamphlets to distribute free. Under present conditions they must pay about 5 cents each; if they were sold at cost they would not be more than about 1 cent each. If the locals could get a regular 5 cent pamphlet at 1 cent they could sell many of them at 5 cents, enabling them to give four times as many away free. This would place them in the position of being able to put a pamphlet in the hands of each person interested.

The Party Bulletin can be used as an advertising medium, for it reaches nearly all party members.

Along with this the National Office ought to keep the locals in touch with the literature bureau by sending a special weekly or monthly communication to all locals, telling them of methods of selling and distributing pamphlets, etc. This information could be gotten from the locals, who would be only too glad to tell of the methods they find meeting with success.

Suggested by George N. Cohen, 3085 Kensington Ave., Philadelphia, Pa., Literature Agent of Local Philadelphia.

Chicago, April 18, 1910.

To the Officers and Delegates, Socialist Congress:

Whereas, The Socialist Party of America has in its ranks some of the ablest writers on economic subjects in the world, among whom may be mentioned Charles Edward Russell, Victor L. Berger, Joseph Medill Patterson, Robert Hunter, Upton Sinclair and a host of others; and

Whereas, The National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party spends every year large sums of money to maintain traveling lecturers and organizers with but indifferent results as compared to the cost; therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Seventh Ward Branch of Cook County, That we re-

spectfully suggest to the conference of the Socialist Party to be held in this city in May, that some plan be adopted whereby the money now expended for traveling lectures shall hereafter be devoted to the employment of the above mentioned and other competent literary experts in preparing pamphlets on the various subjects of public importance, and that these be printed by the National Committee and furnished to the various locals for free distribution.

Yours for the Revolution,

SEVENTH WARD BRANCH,

J. E. McKenna, Chairman.

F. N. Moore, Secretary.

A bureau of statistics to publish monthly such statistics as may be used by the speakers and the authority of such statistics to be given; a permanent statistician to be employed for that purpose.

As per instructions of Local Kings County, New York.

C. L. FURMAN,

W. W. PASSAGE,

Delegates.

Resolution adopted by Watertown, Mass., Socialist Club, and endorsed by the Socialist Club of Lynn, Mass., and by the City Central Committee, Boston Socialist Party Clubs:

It is of paramount importance that the Socialist movement secure representation in the National Congress at the fall elections. In certain congressional districts Socialist strength has developed sufficiently to make a successful contest probable. In order to secure this result our movement should concentrate its efforts at these particular points. The election of Socialist representatives is the next step forward. A Socialist group in congress would electrify the working class to a consciousness of the power that lies dormant within it.

RESOLUTION.

Whereas, The Socialist Party recognizing trades unions to be advance guards in the passing of the inevitable Social revolution; and

Whereas, The Socialist Party constitutes the political wing within the great labor movement; be it, therefore,

Resolved, To stand shoulder to shoulder with the economically organized fellow workers in their ever-waging struggles against the belligerent

Manufacturers' Association and other typical foes to organized labor; and be it further

Resolved, To endorse a policy apt to in its efficiency and expediency secure to the workers under the least expenditure of pain and sacrifice, substantial gains, and with the object in view to legalize demands such as are common to all workers.

LOCAL QUEENS COUNTY,

New York,

H. Schefer, Delegate.

Whereas, the strike, though judicially and administratively shorn of much of its effectiveness, still remains the most potent weapon in the hands of the workers in the incessant industrial warfare between the workers and the capitalists; and

Whereas, Its effectiveness is almost invariably destroyed by the violent and anarchical use by the capitalist class of the overpowering machinery of the state in the form of a criminal constabulary evidenced by irresponsible police brutality directed toward the struggling workers; and

Whereas, The aim of the Socialist Party is fundamentally the capture of the entire powers of the state by the working class for the purpose of using such powers in behalf of the workers in their struggles for industrial betterment and ultimate emancipation; and

Whereas, it is most important that the position of the Socialist Party be known upon the vital question of the attitude to be assumed by its elected administrative officers of the state during the existence of a strike; therefore, be it

Resolved, That during the pendency of all strikes we pledge the elected Socialist administrative officers to use the full powers under their control;

First, to preserve order, prevent violence of all kinds, guaranteeing protection to the property involved by a thorough patrol of it inside and out; and, second, arresting of all strike breakers and private police during any strike, and the prohibition of any person going upon a job to work while a strike is pending between an employer and employees.

SUPREME COURT.

Whereas, The Supreme Court of the United States now exercises as a right the power, whether it possesses it or not,

to declare unconstitutional any law of congress and sometimes does so by a mere majority of one; and

Whereas, Everybody knows that no judge is infallible, that some judges are or may become corruptible, and we, therefore, deem it extremely dangerous to the rights and liberties of the people to permit the Supreme Court of the United States by a majority of one to declare any law of congress unconstitutional; therefore, be it

Resolved, By the members of Local St. Helena, California, of the Socialist Party, that we favor as an immediate political demand of the Socialist Party of the United States that the congress of the United States immediately deprive the Supreme Court of the United States of the power to pass upon the constitutionality of any act of congress.

That at least it deprive the Supreme Court of the United States of the power to declare any law of congress unconstitutional unless the same is so declared by at least two-thirds of the full bench.

Resolved, further, That the congress of the Socialist Party be requested to recommend to the state conventions that they make similar demands applicable to State Supreme Courts.

Resolved further, That we favor a political demand abolishing the franking privilege except on matter pertaining to strictly official business of the several cabinet departments.

F. T. WHEELER, Chairman,

D. WILMOT SMITH, Secretary.

LOCAL ST. HELENA, CAL.

Whereas, So far as we are advised, no flag has yet been officially proclaimed or adopted as the flag of Socialism, international or local; and

Whereas, In view of the numerical strength of international Socialism, we think it is time such flag was considered, adopted and proclaimed; and

Whereas, Since the Socialists of every country seem spontaneously to make use of the red flag in proclaiming themselves Socialists, we favor the adoption of the red flag as the flag that shall stand for international Socialism; and

Whereas, Since Socialism is a world-wide movement, we suggest that such flag have on it on both sides, in size proportionate to the various size of flags, a picture of the world with com-

rades clasping hands around it and the words: "Workers of the World, Unite," the same as on our party button; therefore,

Resolved, By the members of Local St. Helena, California, of the Socialist Party, that we favor the adoption by said congress of the red flag with a picture of the world thereon as above described and the words above quoted, as the flag that shall stand for international Socialism, subject to ratification by the next international congress.

Resolved, further, That this resolution be forwarded to National Secretary J. Mahlon Barnes to be by him handed to the California delegation to the congress or to the congress itself.

F. T. WHEELER, Chairman,

D. WILMOT SMITH, Secretary.

All the statesmen of the Republican and Democratic parties realize that the constitution is inadequate to the needs of the people and offer sops in the shape of amendments and laws which are declared by the (nine autocrats, viz:) Supreme Court, "Unconstitutional," therefore we, the Socialists in mass convention, declare that should the people give us their vote we will call a constitutional convention forthwith.

Submitted by BOULDER BRANCH,

T. W. Bader, Chairman.

J. E. Edwards, Financial Secretary.

Whereas, Internal dissension is, and has been, dividing the Socialist Party of America against itself, resulting in the demoralization of what purports to be the revolutionary organization of the proletariat on the political field in the United States; and

Whereas, The cause of this division amongst ourselves must be found in the adoption in the past of wrong tactical methods; and

Whereas, It is essential that the Socialist Party of America shall ground its form of organization, its policy and its tactics upon what experience and logic point to as necessary for carrying out the revolutionary purpose of the Socialist movement; and

Whereas, it behooves the rank and file—the workers themselves—to readjust the tactical policies of the party to the end that the goal of the movement shall be achieved; and

Whereas, That goal is the administration of industry by a democracy of the workers themselves;

Therefore, Columbia Local Socialist Party of America by unanimous vote declares that:

It is the consensus of opinion of its members that the question of first importance to the working class is, Who shall control the industries and how shall they be administered in the interest of those who do the actual labor of production and distribution? The evident answer is that the industrial plants and the land must be owned and controlled, and that administration must be by an industrial democracy of the working class. Here the question arises, How shall the workers achieve this ownership and control? fundamental question depends the solution of all other questions confronting society. Today the working class is legally deprived of the right to say as to when or where they may perform productive or socially useful labor, what their wages shall be or what disposition is made of the product of their toil. These things are left solely to the class that owns industries and land, and this class makes laws in its exclusive interest through the functioning of the political state.

The ever increasing army of the unemployed proletariat makes more and more precarious the opportunity for workers to employ their own labor power for a wage, and through the action of the state there exists an absolute and tyrannical despotism in the management of industry.

We, the members of Columbia Local, Socialist Party of America, are persuaded that it is, therefore, of more importance to the working class to have the right to vote regarding the management of industry than to vote for political office holders, whether such be Democrats, Republicans or Socialists.

We perceive that the political office holder as an office holder has no power to make laws that shall justly determine when the wheels of industry shall turn, when the workers shall labor, what our wages shall be, or to exercise any control whatsoever over questions that concern labor.

We therefore conclude that, in order to enable the working class to achieve its industrial, therefore social liberty, the very form of governmental administration must be changed from government administered by representatives elected from a geographical locality to a form of administration in

which representation is from the industries and departments of industries.

The conflicting interests between the owning class can be of no concern to the workers whose interests are opposed to every phase of capitalism. To discuss franchises, taxation, child labor and eight hour days as political measures is a waste of time and energy on minor effects of one great cause—Capitalism; and the state is the conservator of Capitalism.

We believe that the Socialist Party of America must readjust itself to the conditions and cease considering questions of political expediency except in so far as it is possible to use political methods for the dissemination of our propaganda and to use political power as a weapon for the destruction of the political form of government.

We believe that the industrial organization of the proletariat is of far greater importance than the building up of the political party; and that in the building of a Socialist political party the goal of our efforts must be the capture of the power of government to the end that this power shall be transferred from the political state to the industrial organization, which shall thereafter administer affairs.

We, therefore, contend that it should be made a part of the fundamental law of the Socialist Party of America, and of its tactical policy, to educate the working class to the necessity of industrial organization to the end that the might of the industrially organized proletariat shall, at the proper time, enforce the will and right of the working class expressed by the ballot, and that the workers shall thereupon assume the function of administration of the world's affairs, industrially.

We conceive the structural form of the social democracy to be industrial and not political, and we believe that the Socialists should bend their energies rather towards organizing their forces on the lines of what Socialist society must be in its ultimate realization than to wasting so much energy in a struggle for political supremacy which at best spells nothing more than a readjustment of the methods of capitalism.

We, therefore, recommend that these questions be studied and be discussed in our local meetings, and in the papers published in the interest of Socialism, and in our next national meeting, and we desire that the expression of

the next general convention in its manifesto shall be made to conform more to the revolutionary idea and less to discussion of non-essentials.

Approved and adopted by unanimous vote of Local Columbia, Columbia, S. C., March 13, 1910, and ordered to be sent to the national secretary of the Socialist Party of America for dissemination in the Official Bulletin.

J. F. CREIGHTON,

Chairman Columbia Local.

W. N. LYNCH,

Secretary.

In conjunction with Comrade Hillquit's report on propaganda among the colleges, we propose that the National Committee offer the amount of \$1,000 to be divided into several graduated prizes for the five best theses on Gustavus Meyers' History of Great American Fortunes, not exceeding 2,500 words, the offer of such prizes to be advertised upon the bulletins of at least ten of the most prominent colleges in the United States at the beginning of the fall sessions of said colleges, and the prizes to be awarded on March 1, 1911, all manuscript to be in the hands of the National Committee on or before January 1, 1911.

By instruction of Local Kings County, New York.

C. L. FURMAN,

W. W. PASSAGE,

Delegates.

REPORT ON ORGANIZATION.

The following report was submitted by the committee appointed to report on the report of Delegate Work on the subject of organization:

"The committee to act upon the report submitted by Comrade Work on organization found that report to consist of two divisions: preamble and specific recommendations. The latter had already been submitted to the Constitution Committee. In the preamble they voted not to concur.

"The committee would recommend as follows:

"First. The election of a commission of five to prepare a plan of organization.

"Second. That this commission have upon it one woman and one foreign speaking member.

"Third. That this commission meet once between now and the convention of 1912.

"Fourth. That all expenses for this meeting of the commission be paid by the National Office.

"(Signed) VICTOR L. BERGER,
"MARGUERITE PREVEY,
"M. T. MAYNARD,
"ED. MOORE,
"G. F. FRAENCKEL."

It was moved and seconded to adopt the report of the committee.

Delegate Goebel moved to amend by referring the report to the National Executive Committee. (Seconded.)

DEL. WORK (Ia.): I just wanted to remind you that I have the right to close the discussion as the reporter on Organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe that the report of this committee and its work can hardly be considered as the final action in consideration of your report. That was acted upon the other day, and your report was disposed of by reference to a committee.

On motion of Del. Wilson of California, Del. Work was given ten minutes to speak on the questions involved in his report.

At the suggestion of National Secretary Barnes, in order to meet a demand for what might otherwise be called "suppressed information," it was moved and carried that Del. Work's report be printed in its regular place in the report of the Congress.

DEL. WORK: Comrade Chairman and Comrades: Comrade Barnes seems to be about the only delegate or person in the congress who sees that it is due to the congress itself, as well as to me, that that is done. Otherwise, it would simply leave the congress in a very disgraceful position if they did not do so, because it would be in the position of having opposed common decency and of having opposed the increasing of the physical and mental efficiency of the working class. At the time that the motion was made to suppress the report, you delegates did not expect to vote for it, nor to vote for anything like it, and you did not conclude to do so until two comrades of international reputation made bitter speeches against my report on Organization. I refer, of course, to Comrade Hunter and Comrade Spargo. I do not believe in personal malice being dragged into any of our proceedings, and I have no personal malice against anybody, either here or anywhere else; but I do think that you ought to know that

those two speeches were made against my report on Organization simply from the motive of personal revenge.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): I want to enter a protest against such a statement as that, especially in the absence of the two comrades in question. I desire to have the protest entered.

DEL. WORK: You can enter your protest, and anybody else can enter his protest, if he desires to do so; but it is the truth just the same; and Comrade Hunter, before he went away, in a truly comradely manner, came and asked my forgiveness, so that he is out of the question. With Comrade Spargo, it is a little more deep-seated. At one time, some time ago, I publicly proved that he had made statements which were not true.

My report on Organization has been charged with not dealing with the subject. This is a charge that cannot be truthfully brought against me. I always stick to the subject, and to show that the report was entirely on the subject, I am going to read to you the titles of what it dealt with in order that you can see that I tell the truth. The report dealt with the following titles: Essentials of effective organization; problems of local organization; our party pledge; membership; national committeemen; official organ; manner of electing national officers; appointment and dismissal of party employees; organizers and lecturers; co-operation between the organization and the Socialist press; national conventions; national referendums; methods of dealing with unemployed members; controversies over state officers; temporary state secretaries; assistance for weak state organizations; account books for state and local organizations; officers of locals and branches; assessments; blank resignations; organization and propaganda among women; methods of nominating candidates; increasing the physical and mental efficiency of the working class in order to increase the efficiency of the organization. All those things were argued for in the part of the report which I read to you, and the rest of the report simply consisted of specific amendments to the national constitution covering those points. And, by the way, I want to tell you that this congress has already adopted a large part of my report on Organization. The report of the Woman's National Committee included one portion of my report on Organization bodily, and this

congress adopted it; and in the report of the Committee on Constitution which you considered nearly all day yesterday and part of today, there were thirteen amendments to the national constitution which were taken from this report on Organization of mine, and out of those thirteen amendments to the national constitution twelve were adopted by this congress yesterday. (Applause.) It seems that, although all of these things were covered in my report, there were a few people in the hall who did not hear anything but one word in that report, and that word was "booze fighting," and that was what brought on all the trouble.

DEL. A. M. LEWIS: Leave it out next time, John.

DEL. WORK: I won't leave it out, but I will put it in stronger than I did the last time. I want to prove to you right now that I was only taking the same stand, though I did not even go as far, that the Socialist national convention took two years ago. I hold in my hand the proceedings of the national convention of the Socialist Party of 1908, and on page 90 of those proceedings I find that Comrade Spargo, who was chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, brought in the anti-intemperance resolution, and Comrade Spargo said this:

"DEL. SPARGO: The last resolution that is part of our report is on the question of alcoholism. The delegates of the convention may know that there is a very considerable sentiment in favor of the convention taking some attitude upon the question of prohibition of the liquor traffic. There has been submitted to the committee and your committee beg to report a resolution which, while not in line with the demand for prohibition of the liquor traffic, nor as stringent as the last resolution of the German party, is nevertheless important in that it is the first time that a Socialist Party convention has been asked to pass upon the question of alcoholism at all. I hope, therefore, that every delegate, and, for that matter, the visitors, will listen as carefully as possible, I will read as carefully as possible so that there may be no misunderstanding:

"We fully recognize the serious evils incident to the manufacture and sale for private profit of alcoholic and adulterated liquors. We hold that any excessive use of liquor by members of the working class is a serious obstacle to

the triumph of our class, since it impairs the vigor of the fighters in the political and economic struggle, and we urge the members of the working class to avoid any indulgence that might hinder the progress of the movement for their emancipation.

"On the other hand, we do not believe that the evils of alcoholism can be remedied by any extension of the police powers of the capitalist state. Alcoholism is a disease of which capitalism is the chief cause, and the remedy lies rather in doing away with the underfeeding, overwork and overworry which result from the wage system."

That is the position that the Socialist convention took upon that subject, and although you may think from the remarks you heard upon the floor of this congress that I had tried to get the congress to adopt prohibition or something of that sort, all that I said in my report was that the members who had these undesirable qualifications for membership ought to try to develop themselves out of those qualities, and I also recommended that at convenient seasons, not all the time, but at convenient seasons, we send out a lecturer to lecture on the subject of health and sanitation and other kindred subjects. That is as far as I went.

I want to read you something else. This book that I have in my mind, is "Socialists at Work," by Robert Hunter. On page 198 of this work I find the following:

"Probably the most interesting development in the care of the children is that of the forest school near Berlin. The German cities having generally provided school physicians, found a large percentage of the children of such delicate health that there was no likelihood of their growing into strong men and women. Bad food and insanitary homes, added to general tendencies, were producing a class of children who must in time become a burden upon the community. Merely as an experiment, a forest school was established, to which several hundred children were sent. They are fed; nurses and doctors attend them; their lessons are given as far as possible in the open air; and every effort is made to build up a strong physical constitution. It has proved an amazingly successful experiment, and after a year or two of attendance practically all of the delicate children return to the ordinary schools in robust health. The food, the doctors, the nurses and the medicine, as

well as the teaching, are supplied at the expense of the community. Other similar schools are now being established, and it is reasonable to hope that within a few years they will have spread all over Germany, with the result that there will be few weak and delicate children at the end of the school period. The Socialists of Lille have undertaken a somewhat similar experiment, and the municipal control of the milk supply, which is now becoming general, is having an excellent effect upon the babies.

"In line with these efforts to solve the problems of morals and health is the war upon alcoholism. It is one of the most important problems that now confront the Socialist party. Aside from the purely humanitarian motives which influence the Socialists to attack alcoholism, there is also a party motive. They fully realize that one of the greatest enemies to the propaganda of their ideas is drunkenness. In many of the European countries almost the only strength remaining to the old political parties among the working class is the support of the shiftless and drunken elements in the large towns and industrial centers. In Belgium the Socialists own a large number of club houses, or Houses of the People, all of which are based upon extensive cafes patronized solely by the working class. Regardless of the financial loss entailed, alcoholic drinks are no longer sold in many of these co-operatives, and the Belgian party is developing a definite political policy against the entire drink traffic. One of the most significant things that has recently happened in Europe is the resolution against alcoholism passed at the last German national conference. In Sweden and the northern countries the Socialists have used their influence to promote the Gothenburg system of controlling the drink traffic. A law prohibiting all traffic in drink was recently passed in Finland, although there is a doubt whether the existence of certain international fiscal treaties will not render it to a certain extent inoperative. The Fabians in London advocate the municipalization of the industry in order to abolish the private interest in the making of drunkards. In Switzerland the drink traffic has been nationalized. In Russia the state's monopoly of spirit retailing was established solely for fiscal purposes and not to decrease drunkenness. The problem is a new one for the Socialist movement, but nearly everywhere in Europe it is beginning with characteristic energy an active campaign

against the liquor traffic and using its tremendous moral power among the masses to combat alcoholism."

Now, all I wish to say in conclusion is that in my opinion the Socialist movement stands and must stand for the highest and the best there is in everything. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The report of the committee, to which this organization report was referred, is now before us. A motion is made to adopt it. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I move as a substitute to refer it to the Executive Committee.

The motion to refer was seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the absence of the Secretary there is a little uncertainty. The chair understands that the committee of this congress on the subject of Government by Commission was made a permanent committee. Is that the sense of the congress, Comrade Thompson?

DEL. THOMPSON: Yes, that is the way I understand the action.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to that? It is so ordered. I hold in my hand a resolution given to me, which I will read:

"Resolved, That this congress does not recognize as a Socialist any one who is not a steady subscriber to a Socialist paper."

THE CHAIRMAN: It is a little bit drastic, but a wholesome proposition.

No action was taken on the resolution.

The Chairman read the following resolution:

"Whereas, The financial assistance of the membership in the United States was a great help to the comrades in Milwaukee, whose victory is a victory for the Socialist movement in the United States; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the National Secretary ascertain the close congressional districts in the United States, and that the membership assist financially and by sending all national speakers available in such districts to elect national representatives at the earliest possible moment."

On motion of Delegate Goebel the resolution was referred to the Executive Committee.

IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE.

The report of the Nominating Committee on Immigration Committee was

read, submitting the following fourteen candidates for the vote of the congress: London, Untermann, Maynard, Wilson, Leo Laukki, Clyde J. Wright, Wanhope, Hillquit, Hunter, T. J. Lewis, Cohen, Gaylord, Valimaki, Prevey.

At the suggestion of Delegate A. M. Lewis of Illinois, the name of Delegate Spargo was added to the list.

On motion of Delegate Strebel, the minutes of last Thursday were approved as published, subject to such correction in the roll call as may be necessary.

The vote was then taken on the Immigration Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: While we are counting the votes, Comrade Cory of Washington will speak.

DEL. CORY: I think it might be well for you to know that out where I live on the Pacific Coast, one county, with something like 970 presidential votes, has started building a hall, and Skagit County, with 862 presidential votes, is building a hall, and we are now building a hall or Socialist Temple in the county where I come from. The comrades are active in this movement all over the state of Washington, and are coming to believe in the Socialists owning their own property, so that we do not have to go to the capitalist class to rent halls any longer.

On motion of Del. McDermott the

thanks of the congress were extended to the local delegates and local committee and resident comrades, for the excellent manner in which the work has been done.

On motion of Delegate DeBell the minutes of the congress as a whole were approved.

On motion the publication and editing of the proceedings of this congress were referred to the National Executive Committee; the debates, papers and essential proceedings to be in full, and unnecessary points of order or unessential matters to be omitted.

The report of the tellers on the vote on the Immigration Committee was made. The vote was as follows, the first seven constituting the committee: Untermann, 38; London, 32; Laukki, 31; Wanhope, 29; Wilson, 28; Spargo, 28; Hunter, 27. The following failed of election: Valimaki, 26; T. J. Lewis, 25; Prevey, 24; Gaylord, 24; Cohen, 23; Hillquit, 21; Maynard, 12; Wright, 9.

The members of the congress then, under the leadership of Delegate Strebel, sang the "Red Flag" and the "Marseillaise," and after a standing silent tribute to the memory of the late Comrades M. W. Wilkins and Ben Hanford, and with three cheers for Socialism and three cheers for Milwaukee, the congress, at 4:54 p. m., adjourned sine die.

INDEX

A

Aaltonen, Frank—17, 167, 168, 239, 246, 264, 288, 289, 307, 308.
 Adams, Wm.—4, 17, 59, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Adel, E. E.—4, 167, 168, 235, 236, 239, 243, 246, 288, 289.
 Allen, C. C.—3, 22, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Ameringer, Oscar—4, 16, 22, 127, 136, 167, 168, 220, 221, 223, 225, 227, 233, 235, 236, 239, 246, 256, 288, 289.
 Atwood, E. Francis—4, 10, 13, 14, 80, 124, 167, 168, 197, 235, 236, 239, 246, 288, 289.

B

Barnes, J. Mahlon—3, 4, 5, 7, 16, 17, 23, 36, 37, 59, 93, 168, 251, 252, 267, 268, 301, 302, 316.
 Barnes, J. W.—3, 167, 168, 239, 246, 280, 288, 289, 306.
 Bassett, Arthur—4, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Behrens, E. T.—3, 83, 102, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Bell, W. J.—4, 5, 11, 12, 22, 37, 167, 168, 227, 239, 246, 249, 250, 255, 288, 289.
 Berger, Victor L.—4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 22, 25, 26, 34, 56, 58, 59, 60, 73, 74, 77, 92, 93, 118, 120, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 132, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 149, 167, 168, 169, 170, 174, 175, 176, 177, 188, 189, 191, 208, 209, 211, 229, 230, 236, 237, 239, 242, 243, 245, 246, 248, 249, 251, 252, 253, 256, 262, 268, 272, 275, 276, 287, 288, 289, 312, 316.
 Bloor, Ella Reeve—3, 17, 22, 37, 167, 168, 181, 183, 184, 189, 196, 197, 211, 237, 239, 246, 258, 260, 288, 289.
 Branstetter, Winnie E.—4, 11, 12, 58, 59, 72, 75, 136, 167, 168, 181, 182, 184, 194, 207, 211, 220, 239, 246, 257, 258, 288, 289, 293.
 Brewer, George D.—3, 123, 136, 167, 168, 234, 238, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Brown, W. Thurston—4, 22, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Buchanan, W. W.—4, 167, 168, 288, 289.

Burke, John P.—4, 167, 168, 169, 221, 239, 246, 282, 288, 289.
 Burton, W. H.—4, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.

C

California Delegation—4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 22.
 Cannon, E. L.—4, 22, 124, 126, 133, 167, 168, 233, 239, 246, 277, 278, 288, 289, 311.
 Cannon, Jos. D.—3, 51, 58, 124, 167, 168, 199, 200, 237, 239, 241, 246, 287, 288, 311.
 Carey, James F.—3, 14, 20, 21, 22, 38, 58, 136, 167, 168, 205, 206, 209, 239, 246, 268, 273, 287, 288, 289.
 Carpenter, W.—3, 22, 37, 167, 168, 235, 236, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Cassidy, Frank—4, 81, 118, 126, 167, 168, 182, 239, 246, 278, 279, 285, 288, 289, 307.
 Christensen, S. J.—4.
 Cohen, Joseph E.—17, 22, 37, 74, 167, 168, 204, 209, 239, 242, 246, 249, 277, 279, 288, 289, 319.
 Collins W. P.—3, 21, 22, 37, 56, 59, 60, 61, 75, 128, 167, 168, 182, 221, 239, 246, 254, 260, 288, 289.
 Coonrod, T. J.—3, 22, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Committee on Commission Form of Government—
 Provision for—58.
 Nomination of—58.
 Election of—75, 301.
 Report of—290.
 Supplemental Report of—293.
 Committee on Constitution—
 Provision for—7, 11.
 Nomination of—22.
 Election of—37.
 Report of—237-277.
 Supplemental Report of—259.
 Minority Reports of—240, 270.
 Committee on Farmers' Program—
 Report of—211.
 Debate on—220-235.
 Committee on Contested Seats—
 Provision for—7, 9, 10.
 Nomination of—10.

Election of—10.
 Report of—22.
 Committee on Immigration—290, 295, 301, 308, 318, 319.
 Report of—75.
 Minority Report of—77.
 Substitute for Reports of—98.
 Amendment to Substitute—106.
 Debate on—80-167.
 Committee on Resolutions—
 Provision for—7, 11.
 Nomination of—22.
 Election of—22.
 Report of—277-289, 302.
 Cory, Mrs. E. D.—4, 10, 121, 167, 168, 199, 239, 246, 273, 288, 289, 319.
 Cumbie, J. T.—4, 10, 22, 167, 168, 228, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Crider, Dan C.—235, 236, 239, 246.

D

Davis, G. W.—4, 167, 168, 236, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 De Bell, James A.—3, 10, 17, 22, 37, 74, 80, 92, 93, 117, 122, 167, 168, 169, 224, 235, 239, 245, 246, 248, 250, 256, 257, 260, 261, 264, 271, 288, 289, 293, 299, 300, 301, 302, 319.
 De Lara, L. Guiterrez—304.
 Dills, Park—4, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 D'Orsay, Harriet—3, 9, 10, 16, 22, 55, 58, 60, 167, 168, 194, 205, 239, 246, 288, 289.

E

Economoff, Dimitri—4.

F

Fackert, Max—4, 10, 167, 168, 204, 239, 246, 249, 262, 288, 289.
 Foreign Speaking Organizations—4, 5, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 36, 259, 307.
 Fraenckel, G. T.—3, 5, 10, 20, 56, 57, 58, 60, 101, 162, 167, 168, 174, 175, 182, 239, 243, 246, 248, 288, 289, 316.
 Furman, C. L.—4, 37, 58, 59, 74, 167, 168, 170, 223, 229, 239, 241, 246, 284, 285, 288, 289, 306, 309, 310, 312, 315.

G

Garver, W. L.—3, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Gaylord, W. R.—4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 19, 22, 37, 49, 55, 58, 59, 74, 131, 132, 160, 162, 167, 168, 234, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 263, 265, 266, 267, 270, 274, 288, 289, 306, 319.
 Germer, Adolph—3, 22, 133, 142, 167, 168, 277, 311.

Giese, Robert—3, 167, 168, 288, 289.
 Goebel, Geo. H.—4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 22, 23, 37, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 73, 74, 80, 92, 114, 118, 167, 168, 175, 176, 177, 182, 198, 201, 202, 236, 248, 250, 254, 260, 262, 270, 275, 277, 288, 289, 300, 302, 308, 316, 318.

H

Haines, T. H.—4, 135, 144, 167, 168, 174, 239, 246, 288, 289, 306.
 Hanford, Ben—319.
 Heckala, John—4, 22, 135, 167, 168, 239, 247, 288, 289.
 Hermanovitch, R.—16, 17.
 Hillquit, Morris—4, 5, 34, 38, 58, 60, 61, 71, 72, 73, 74, 98, 100, 101, 102, 103, 106, 107, 108, 109, 114, 117, 120, 124, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 135, 137, 141, 142, 143, 145, 152, 154, 156, 157, 159, 162, 167, 168, 169, 172, 175, 181, 182, 183, 184, 186, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 196, 201, 203, 204, 209, 210, 239, 246, 256, 272, 288, 289, 315, 319.
 Hiltunen, Toivo—4.
 Hochscheid, Paul—4, 167, 168, 239, 247, 288, 289.
 Holm, N. F.—4, 19, 93, 138.
 Hoogerhyde, J.—3, 10, 11, 51, 167, 168, 236, 239, 246, 277, 288, 289.
 Houston, Harold W.—4, 58, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.
 Hubschmitt, Frank—4, 17, 18, 139, 167, 168, 174, 239, 246, 261, 288, 289, 301.
 Hunter, Robert—15, 17, 34, 54, 58, 59, 114, 119, 125, 126, 133, 153, 160, 161, 233, 234, 235, 236, 246, 272, 287, 312, 316, 317, 319.
 Hurst, Fred—4, 73, 167, 168, 239, 246, 266, 267, 288, 289, 311.
 Hutchisson, C. G.—3, 59, 75, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288.

I

International Secretaries—11, 12, 26, 49, 174, 259.
 Reports of—170, 172.

J

Jacobsen, J. J.—3, 11, 58, 59, 75, 83, 167, 168, 170, 174, 239, 246, 273, 288, 289, 290, 293, 299.
 Judges—18.

K

Kaplan, Morris—3, 4, 9, 17, 112, 133, 164, 167, 168, 221, 239, 246, 248, 288, 289.
 Kennedy, Thomas F.—4, 10, 60, 93, 122, 123, 167, 168, 236, 237, 239, 246, 253, 288, 289.

Killingbeck, W. B.—4, 17, 22, 121, 139,
167, 168, 236, 238, 239, 240, 246, 251,
252, 254, 277, 288, 289, 311.
Kirkland, C. E.—301.
Klawa, John—4.
Klawier, I.—4, 17, 18, 152, 183.
Kochanowicz, J.—4, 284.
Kokos, Casimir—156.
Kummerfeld, Henry—3, 22, 37, 167, 168,
225, 239, 246, 288, 289.

L

Lane, C. B.—167, 168, 239, 246, 288, 289.
Lanfersiek, Walter—3, 22, 167, 168, 239,
246, 249, 288, 289, 306.
Laukki, Leo—3, 19, 167, 168, 235, 236,
239, 246, 261, 288, 289, 319.
Laukki, Mrs. Esther—19, 140, 167, 168,
186, 187, 207, 211, 220, 239, 246, 288,
289.
Lee, Algernon—4, 10, 11, 13, 17, 22, 73,
106, 114, 117, 124, 126, 127, 142, 156,
157, 158, 159, 162, 167, 168, 169, 212,
216, 219, 239, 246, 248, 252, 253, 254,
255, 256, 257, 269, 277, 285, 288, 289,
302, 303, 304, 306, 307, 308, 309, 316.
Lewis, A. M.—3, 10, 22, 57, 58, 60, 136,
167, 168, 226, 227, 228, 231, 235, 236,
239, 246, 288, 289, 301, 304, 306, 308,
309, 317, 319.
Lewis, Lena Morrow—15, 28, 136, 191,
208, 211, 220.
Lewis, Tom J.—4, 5, 17, 22, 37, 58, 60,
141, 145, 152, 162, 165, 167, 168, 224,
226, 231, 235, 239, 246, 288, 289, 290,
319.
London, Meyer—4, 17, 18, 19, 127, 160,
163, 295, 319.
Lowe, Caroline A.—3, 22, 37, 167, 168,
181, 186, 187, 211, 220, 239, 246, 260,
270, 271, 273, 274, 288, 289.

M

Malkiel, Theresa—181, 182, 184, 185, 187,
193, 202, 205, 207, 211, 220.
Maurer, James H.—13, 17, 167, 168, 175,
176, 235, 236, 239, 244, 246, 278, 282,
288, 289.
Maynard, Mila Tupper—3, 15, 22, 58, 60,
108, 114, 152, 161, 167, 168, 179, 184,
196, 199, 200, 205, 207, 211, 220, 239,
246, 258, 288, 289, 316, 319.
McAllister, W. W.—3, 7, 10, 105, 119,
133, 167, 168, 239, 242, 246, 281, 288,
289.
McDermott, Geo. W.—3, 50, 74, 110, 151,
167, 168, 211, 239, 246, 288, 289, 300,
319.
McLevy, Jasper—3, 22, 58, 59, 75, 167,
168, 239, 246, 255, 277, 288, 289, 293.
Merrick, Fred H.—26, 58, 92, 103, 104,

106, 123, 167, 168, 197, 205, 233, 239,
246, 249, 250, 256, 275, 288, 289, 298,
301, 306, 308, 309.
Miller, W. H.—4, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288,
289.
Montefiore, Dora B.—5, 6, 136.
Moore, Ed—17, 22, 37, 49, 50, 58, 60,
167, 168, 239, 241, 246, 248, 249, 256,
288, 289, 316.
Morgan, T. J.—3, 8, 10, 15, 22, 37, 54,
100, 104, 120, 127, 142, 143, 145, 157,
167, 168, 198, 201, 202, 223, 226, 227,
230, 231, 238, 239, 243, 246, 257, 277,
288, 289, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 302,
307, 308, 310.
Morton, Rufus J.—4, 167, 168, 239, 246,
288, 289, 306.

N

Nash, J. E.—3, 35, 136, 167, 168, 239, 246,
265, 266, 267, 288, 289, 309.
Nelson, A. W.—3, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288,
289.
New Castle Situation—236.
Novak, Joseph—4, 262.

O

O'Hare, Kate Richards—3, 58, 60, 73,
100, 167, 168, 182, 185, 186, 189, 232,
233, 235, 236, 239, 246, 288, 289, 302.
Oneal, James—3, 9, 18, 167, 168, 239,
246, 288, 289.
O'Neil, W. L.—4, 14, 49, 51, 60, 150, 167,
168, 169, 239, 247, 275, 276, 288, 289.
Osborne, J. B.—3, 22, 59, 75, 167, 168,
181, 239, 246, 288, 289.

P

Passage, W. W.—4, 18, 144, 167, 168, 239,
246, 288, 289, 306, 309, 310, 312, 315.
Pellegrine, James C.—4.
Pekos, Rokos—4.
Permanent Secretary—17.
Peterson, G. A.—3, 17, 167, 168, 239, 246,
288, 289.
Prevey, Marguerite—4, 5, 6, 10, 57, 58,
60, 98, 167, 168, 169, 176, 187, 200,
211, 220, 239, 246, 283, 288, 289, 316,
319.

R

Reading Clerk—18.
Report of National Secretary—23.
Report on Organization—38.
Debate on—49-58.
Special Committee on—
Provision for—55, 58.
Nomination of—58.
Election of—60.
Report of—315.

Report on Propaganda—61.
Debate on—71-74.
Resolutions—
On Labor Organizations—277.
On Fred Warren—302.
On Free Press Fight—302.
On White Slave Traffic—302.
On Socialist Plate Matter—303.
On Literature Bureau—303.
On Workmen's Compensation—303.
On Industrial Training—303.
On Mexico—304.
On Finland—306.
On Congressional Program—306.
On Deportation and Abuse—306.
On Unorganized States—306.
On Foreign Speaking Organizations—
307.
On Labor Temple—307.
Of Thanks—308.
Not adopted—309-315, 318.
Reynolds, S. M.—3, 22, 37, 167, 168, 239,
246, 260, 271, 273, 288, 289, 309, 310,
311.
Ringler, Robert B.—4, 14, 17, 167, 168,
239, 246, 255, 288, 289.
Roewer, Geo. E., Jr.—3, 5, 17, 38, 59, 83,
137, 167, 168, 196, 236, 239, 246, 270,
288, 289.
Roll Call—17, 22, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288,
289.
Rose, S. W.—4, 19, 22, 58, 59, 75, 93,
167, 168, 198, 239, 247, 288, 289, 293,
306, 311.
Royal, A. J.—58, 59, 75, 167, 168, 239,
247, 288, 289, 306.
Rules of Procedure—6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13,
14, 15, 16, 175.

S

Schefer, H.—4, 167, 168, 246, 288, 289,
313.
Schnaidt, E. L.—4, 54, 167, 168, 239, 246,
249, 252, 281, 288, 289.
Seidel, Emil—137, 156, 167, 168, 169, 230,
233, 239, 247, 285, 288, 289.
Sergeant-at-arms—17, 60.
Silver, Grace V.—3, 17, 167, 168, 239, 246,
288, 289.
Simons, A. M.—3, 9, 16, 22, 52, 53, 58,
167, 168, 174, 176, 181, 182, 188, 189,
190, 191, 193, 197, 211, 212, 220, 221,
223, 226, 230, 231, 232, 234, 238, 239,
240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 246, 249, 250,
251, 253, 256, 257, 266, 274, 288, 289,
297, 298, 300, 301, 303, 308.
Simons, May Wood—177, 181, 189, 200,
201, 202, 205, 209, 211, 220, 239, 247,
288, 289.
Skala, Steve—4, 265.
Slotton, E. B.—4, 167, 168, 239, 247, 288,
289, 306.

Smith, J. Frank—4, 167, 168, 239, 247,
288, 289.
Socialist Press—31, 32, 33, 39, 45.
Socialist Vote—30, 31.
Spargo, John—15, 55, 60, 77, 80, 92, 93,
94, 98, 99, 100, 103, 117, 133, 142, 152,
154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 162, 164, 165,
166, 210, 316, 317, 319.
Strebel, Gustave—4, 10, 17, 18, 38, 60, 75,
88, 93, 124, 136, 138, 145, 167, 168,
170, 182, 183, 208, 236, 239, 240, 246,
250, 288, 289, 295, 299, 319.

T

Telegrams and Communications—6, 59,
277, 308.
Tellers—17.
Temporary Secretary—5.
Thomas, E. H.—4, 5, 22, 211, 277, 282,
308.
Thompson, Carl D.—4, 9, 10, 38, 58, 75,
83, 136, 167, 168, 170, 221, 228, 232,
236, 239, 243, 246, 250, 251, 252, 274,
275, 276, 283, 285, 288, 289, 293, 295,
298, 299, 300, 301, 307, 318.

U

Untermann, Ernest—3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 16, 22,
37, 38, 77, 80, 81, 83, 92, 93, 94, 95,
96, 98, 113, 114, 122, 123, 126, 127,
130, 135, 139, 150, 152, 153, 156, 158,
159, 162, 164, 167, 168, 232, 233, 234,
235, 236, 239, 246, 281, 285, 286, 288,
289, 298, 300, 319.

V

Valimaki, John—17, 146, 261, 319.

W

Wanhope, Joseph—4, 22, 75, 77, 122, 126,
127, 142, 148, 154, 162, 167, 168, 239,
246, 288, 289, 319.
Waynick, W. H.—4, 22, 147, 167, 168,
239, 246, 278, 286, 288, 289.
Wentworth, Marion Craig—167, 168, 189,
194, 205, 239, 246, 288, 289.
White, Dan A.—58, 106, 167, 168, 237,
239, 244, 246, 288, 289.
Wilde, John H.—3, 7, 22, 167, 168, 239,
246, 288, 289, 295, 296.
Wilkins, M. W.—319.
Willert, John G.—4, 7, 8, 22, 167, 168,
196, 211, 239, 246, 261, 268, 277, 288,
289.
Wilson, J. Stitt—3, 8, 22, 37, 58, 59, 60,
154, 167, 168, 182, 206, 209, 210, 211,
239, 246, 260, 288, 289, 290, 293, 295,
296, 301, 316, 319.
Wolff, Barnett—4, 10, 14, 19, 129, 143.

Woman's National Committee—42, 48,
53, 72, 211, 258, 303, 316.

Report of—177.

Debate on—182-211.

Work, John M.—3, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 22,
26, 28, 37, 38, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54,
55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 167, 168, 175, 176,
182, 210, 211, 239, 241, 246, 250, 260,
271, 288, 289, 315, 316, 317.

Wright, Clyde J.—3, 22, 26, 28, 167, 168,
221, 225, 226, 235, 236, 239, 246, 288,
289, 319.

Z

Zimmerman, P. G.—4, 167, 168, 239, 246,
289.

Zitt, L. A.—4, 15, 167, 168, 239, 246, 288